Pol. g.
264 m

Ensor

NB. Zu hier eingeklebt gewesenem, auf einem schmalen Foliostreifen gedruckten englischen Gedicht:

Sirner-Stocking.

Why, couples, why?

(20 vierzeilige Strophen) wurde bei P. a. engl. aufgestellt

28/X 59

AN INQUIRY

CONCERNING

The Population of Nations:

CONTAINING

A REFUTATION OF MR. MALTHUS'S

ESSAY ON POPULATION.

By GEORGE ENSOR, Esq.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR EFFINGHAM WILSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE.

1818.

Printed by R. and A. Taylor, Shoe-lane, London.

4-

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHAPTER IX.

PART II.

Chapter I.

Chapter II.

Chapter III.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.

CHAPTER IV.

CHAPTER V.

THE POPULATION OF NATIONS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction.—Populousness encouraged and enforced by Athenian, Lacedemonian, Roman, Jewish, Persian, Mahometan, Chinese, Hindoo, Gaulish legislators.

THE anxiety which population has excited; its increasing interest; the new and accumulating assemblage of facts; the various views of writers; their advances towards truth; their errors; their incongruities; the importance and difficulty of the subject,—have induced me to investigate population in its most interesting relations.

Let me state, that though I have briefly noticed some particulars connected with the main topic of discussion; as marriage, property, poverty, subsistence—reserving them for a future treatise;—I have not omitted any particular which seemed to me necessarily associated with population. My object has been, in treating this subject, to preserve unity of design with ampleness and despatch in the execution.

Let me also premise, that I hope my opinion will not be hastily assumed: I may deny an author's statement, yet believe him honest; I may disregard his argument, yet admit his positions; I may acquiesce in the course of his reasoning, yet resist his inference. Right and wrong should both be exhibited at once, to win the erroneous from their misconceptions, and to confirm the intelligent in the rectitude of their views, reasonings, and sentiments. Besides, the thoughts and projects of writers and legislators should be displayed in favor of opposite systems, in order that the sincere and unsophisticated may possess the whole subject:— thus only can they be enabled to attain an adequate and satisfactory conclusion; for thus the mind is purified from prejudices, and conviction attains the dignity of science.

A numerous population has been generally esteemed a positive good; some have qualified their expressions respecting it, while a few repute populousness a positive evil. The latter doctrine, which appears paradoxical, I shall hereafter investigate: at present I proceed to specify some of the statesmen and philosophers who have favored by their authority and institutions the increase of mankind. First, of legislators; and first among these, the Athenians, who rank chief among the nations of antiquity.

Among the Athenians parentage gave a distinguishing prerogative. According to Dinarchus[1], fathers of legitimate children were alone eligible to the ministry and to military command; lawful offspring

[1] Adversus Demosthenem: Opera Demosth. p. 99.

were also necessary to enable orators to address the people[1]. Parents recruited the democracy, and they were in consequence considered by those who framed the law[2], more interested in the execution of their office. The Athenians also enacted compulsory laws to induce population, and bachelors were subjected to penalties[3].

The Lacedemonians were equally intent with the Athenians, by rewards and penalties, by honors and infamy, to encourage population; indeed Plutarch[4] couples Lycurgus and Solon as zealously promoting the same object. By the laws of Sparta, those citizens who had three children were free from watch and ward; and those who had four, according to Aristotle[5], or five, according to Ælian[6], were exempted from all public employments: while those who abstained from marriage were oppressed[7], discredited[8], fined, and the fine reiterated: they were also excluded from the schools of exercise, particularly from those in which the naked virgins exhibited their prowess. *Incorrigible* bachelors were also at certain festivals dragged round the altars and beaten by the women[9]; and to consummate their misery, they sunk into the grave hated and disgraced. An old bachelor at Sparta was reputed an outcast, selfish and sterile; while

[1] Petit, Leges Atticæ, p. 262. [2] Thucydides, lib. 2. p. 128.
[3] Julius Pollux, lib. 3, Περι Αγαμων. [4] Moralia, p. 259.
[5] De Repub. lib. 2. c. 9. [6] Historia Varia, lib. 6. c. 6.
[7] Apud Stobæum, sermo 64. p. 412.
[8] Plutarch. in Lysandro et in Lycurgo.
[9] Athenæus, lib. 13. p. 555.

the father of a family was distinguished in manhood, reverenced in age, and honored as a public benefactor and a common parent. By his children he enjoyed the prerogative of representing the dignity of the state, and by them the desperate valor of Spartan patriots obtained a double crown of glory. Of the three hundred chosen Spartans who sacrificed themselves for the liberty of Greece at Thermopylæ with Leonidas, all, says the historian[1], had children.

The statesmen at Rome pursued the same policy, and by more various expedients than those adopted by Athens or Lacedemon. The *jus trium liberorum* was inserted in the Roman code; which *equity*[2] (such is the language of the law) was enlarged for those who had four children, and which again was amplified when the family increased to five[3]. Children were the most powerful intercessors for an offending parent, and criminals as they enumerated their offspring reduced the customary inflictions of the law. Children relieved the dependent from subjection: even women, who have been degraded in most nations, at Rome were taught to regard their children as their sureties for emancipation. Mothers who had three children escaped tutelage[4], and a freed woman who had four attained unconditional liberty[5].

In aid of these inducements, Julius Cæsar con-

[1] Herodotus, lib. 7. c. 205. [2] Suetonius, lib. 5. c. 21.

[3] Domat, Civil Law, p. 271. Gravina says, "Concessa fuit immunitas onerum personalium." De Jur. Civ. p. 348.

[4] Taylor's Civil Law, p. 120.

[5] Columella, lib. i. c. 8.

ferred presents on those who had many children[1], and Augustus increased their amount[2]. At Rome also the married had a distinct place in the theatre[3], an honor not unimportant among a people so fond of public exhibitions. Married persons were preferred to public employments, and by the *lex Papia Poppæa* their pretensions were advanced by one year for each of their children[4]. Beside rewards and prerogatives to bribe individuals to marriage, the Romans enacted penalties and disabilities against those who abstained from that contract:—a legatee forfeited his bequest, if in a hundred days after the death of the testator he was not married[5]; and in order that marriages might be contracted for the purpose of population, a married man without children could only receive half of the sum bequeathed to him[6]. Furius Camillus obliged the unmarried with threats and fines to espouse those widowed by the wars[7]. Julius and Augustus Cæsar sanctioned by laws the acts of the censors, and inflicted on bachelors the fine *uxorium*[8]. To all these instigations by pain and pleasure, superstition added its sanction, and a marvellous story was related[9] of the destruction of the Fabii who neglected to obey the ordinance of marriage.

[1] Dion Cassius, lib. 43. c. 25. [2] Ibid. lib. 56. c. 10.

[3] Gravina, p. 348. [4] "Ut annum adderent singuli ad ætatem parentis, &c. is candidatus præferretur qui plures liberos haberet, quamvis ætate esset inferior." Gravina, p. 347 et seq.

[5] Gravina, p. 352. [6] Taylor, Civil Law, p. 145.

[7] Plutarch. in Camillum. [8] Valerius Maximus, lib. 2. c. 9.

[9] Dion. Halicarnass. lib. 9. c. 22.

Nor should the Jews be omitted in this summary. To "increase and multiply," they reputed a divine command. Under this impression some have argued that the longevity of the antediluvians was a means adopted by Providence for this purpose[1]. Whatever occasioned the procrastinated being of those people, there can be no doubt of their anxiety to enlarge their population: a new married man was exonerated from all civil business, and he was freed from the paramount duties of war for one year[2]. The Jews also held, that to satisfy the law a man should be married at twenty years of age[3], and that he who neglected the precept of "Increase and multiply" was a homicide[4].

The Persians were not less attentive than other nations to the populousness of their empire. Herodotus[5] says that a Persian was respected according to the number of his children, and that the king sent annual presents to those who were so fortunate and so serviceable. Nor were the women of Persia without their public rewards on such occasions. Plutarch[6]

[1] The Rev. Dr. Millar, late fellow of Trinity-college Dublin, in what he entitled "Philosophy of History" doubts this, as Noah's progeny was not more numerous than that of many existing families as favorably circumstanced: vol. 1. p. 119. He supposes that their longevity was intended to maintain the principle of patriarchal government. p. 123.—Why? [2] Deut. chap. 24.

[3] Selden De J. Nat. &c. lib. 5. c. 3. p. 545.

[4] "Quicunque negligit præceptum de multiplicatione humani generis, habendum esse veluti homicidam." Ibid. p. 549.

[5] lib. 1. c. 136. Strabo, lib. 15. t. 2. p. 491.

[6] Moralia, p. 146.

relates that Alexander doubled the gifts to pregnant women, which had been instituted by Cyrus.

Mahomet and his followers have been equally zealous for marriage and population. Thornton [1] says, that at Constantinople no unmarried man,—or, what is esteemed the same, who has not a female in his family,—would be permitted to keep an independent establishment. "The women of this religion," says Lady W. Montague, "are taught to believe that they best ensure their future happiness by employing themselves in making young mussulmans, while those who die unproductive perish in a reprobate state."

The laws and writings of the Chinese, ancient and modern, abound with the most exalted expressions in favor of marriage and children.

The civil and religious code of the Hindoo [2] considers marriage an indispensable duty: in consequence, Moor [3] states that "so universal is matrimony among the Hindoos, that it would be difficult to find an unhusbanded female of a respectable family arrived at puberty—that is of the age of eleven or twelve."

The ancient Gauls [4] considered their countrymen disgraced who were unmarried at twenty years of age: yet the penalty for celibacy was not inflicted among the Romans [5], before the bachelor attained his twenty-

[1] State of Turkey, vol. 2. p. 252. This may also proceed from jealousy of married men.

[2] Orme's History: Dissertation, &c. p. 6.

[3] Hindoo Infanticide, p. 2.

[4] Pastoret des Loix, partie 4. p. 88.

[5] Gravina, p. 352.

fifth year. The modern French have their inducements to marriage; and almost all European nations distinguish by honors, prerogatives, exemptions, privations, pains, or disgraces, (which I shall hereafter particularize,) the different states of celibacy and marriage.

If we turn from civilized society to rude life, the savage tribes appear still more interested for the sufficiency of their people by the frequent incorporation of their enemies. Heriot [1] mentions the Miamacs, Iroquois and Albinaquis among the Indians, who elect their chiefs on account of their numerous offspring.

CHAPTER II.

Philosophers favored populousness.

PHILOSOPHERS succeed legislators in their admiration and recommendations of marriage and children. Pythagoras [2], agreeably to his habit of associating earth and heaven, said that men should marry in order to leave new adorers of God. Clemens of Alexandria [3], a fit commentator of such doctrine, insisted that Pythagoras rejected beans because they occasioned sterility in women. Plato adopted his master's fantastic expressions, adding [4], that women divorced should repeat their marriage until they had produced children for themselves and the state. Hierocles [5] considered the procreation of children an act of gratitude to pa-

[1] Travels in Canada, p. 551. [2] Iamblichus, Pythag. Vita, c. 18.
[3] Stromata, lib. 3. p. 435. [4] De Legibus, lib. 11. p. 974.
[5] Apud Stobæum, sermo 73. p. 449.

rents: and Epaminondas, the only general whom antiquity has classed with philosophers, on being asked what one unmarried and childless should do to serve his country, replied, "Die for it[1]."

Authors of the last and present century have also been decisive in their praise of population. Vauban[2] assumes that "the abundance of people is the means of all things:"—Mirabeau[3], that "population is the first of social goods." In the *Elémens de la Politique*[4] it is stated that the people should be as numerous as possible. Germans and Spaniards have enforced the same theme: so have the Italians, and none more than Filangieri[5], who reputes *populazione et richezze* equivalent.

The English have added their voice to the great majority for the multiplication of mankind. Sir William Temple[6] proposed a tax on bachelors when they were twenty-five years old, "since the late custom among us of marrying late or never." Bolingbroke[7] insisted "that the increase of people must be always an advantage, and can never be hurtful to any state." Swift[8] as vehemently said, that "it is an undoubted maxim that the people are the riches of a country." Sir James Steuart[9] affirmed that "the increase of numbers in a state shews youth and vigour." The *Encyclopedia Britannica* concludes, "As the strength and

[1] Apud Stobæum. sermo 66. p. 421.
[2] Dixme Royale, p. 22.
[3] "Le premier des biens de la société." L'Ami des Hommes, t. 1. c. 2.
[4] "Aussi nombreux qu'il soit possible," t. 1. c. 14. p. 205.
[5] Della Legislazione, lib. 2. c. 1.
[6] Works, folio, vol. 1. p. 268.
[7] Philosophical Works, vol. 4. p. 112.
[8] Works, vol. 9. p. 396.
[9] Polit. Œcon. b. 1. c. 12.

glory of a kingdom or state consist in the multitude of its subjects, celibacy above all things should be discouraged." Dagge [1], "that the strength of every commonwealth chiefly consists in the number of its inhabitants." Paley [2] speaks of "the importance of population, and the superiority of it above every other national advantage—that it is the true and absolute interest of a country." And Mr. Bentham, in the language of Mons. Dumont, considers "*la force et la richesse d'une nation—le nombre des hommes* [3]."

CHAPTER III.

Legislators and authors unfriendly to population.

SOME legislators and writers have, on the contrary, been unfriendly to the birth of children and the increase of mankind. The Thracians mourned when a child was born, and rejoiced at its decease [4]. So did the Causini [5],—so did those who lived in the neighbourhood of Caucasus [6]. Heraclides [7] says the same of the Locri, and Mela [8] of the Essedones:—the Siks [9] are equally perverse in their expressions of joy and sorrow.

[1] Criminal Law, &c. p. 272. [2] Essays on Population, vol. 2. p. 370.

[3] Théorie, &c. t. 1. p. 238. This list might be enlarged indefinitely to the same purpose. Dr. Burn in his Observations on an equal Land Tax argues this opinion with great judgement.

[4] Herodotus, lib. 5. c. 4. Sextus Empiricus, p. 158.

[5] Nicolaus Damascenus, p. 570. Apud Stobæum, sermo 119. p. 603.

[6] Strabo, lib. 11. t. 2. p. 135. [7] Ibid. p. 532.

[8] lib. 2. c. i. [9] History of Dekkan, vol. 2. p. 143.

Puffendorf[1] speaks timorously of an excessive population—that thus a nation may sink under the weight of its own people. The same was afterwards repeated in France, which induced an English writer sneeringly to say, "The discovery is attributed to Mirabeau."

In our own island similar terrors have been occasionally expressed. Harrison quaintly observed, "Some do grudge at the increase of the people in these days, thinking a necessary brood of cattle far better than a superfluous augmentation of mankind." Cock[2], in a pamphlet published in 1658, asserted that the increase of the people was so much dreaded that a poor man was not permitted to marry till the age of thirty, nor a poor woman till she was twenty-five. Mr. Ricardo, who published his Essay on Political Economy last year, advises that government should make some effort to restrain the improvident marriages of the lower orders[3]. Dr. Whitaker, in the year preceding, lamented the numbers and sturdiness of the people: "Under the Gascoignes and the Nevils the features of Hunslet were a great manor-house, a park, a slender and obsequious population[4];" and "I need not expose the contrast." But of all writers, Mr. Malthus is most deranged by the prospect of an excessive population. It is in him a dread, an alarm, a horror, a sin unsatisfied, a constitutional malady, which truth and error, knowledge and ignorance, cruelly feed and

[1] lib. 6. c. 1. He also speaks of a legal prohibition of the marriage of the poor, p. 331.

[2] Barrington's Ancient Statutes, p. 395. [3] p. 112.

[4] Topography of Leeds. He repeats this precious sentiment.

inflame: for while he insists that men cannot multiply without corresponding, or rather anticipated, subsistence[1], he talks as if somehow they could attain a multitudinous increase without food, and then perish superlatively even beyond the excess of their mysterious augmentation.

CHAPTER IV.

Contradictions of states and writers respecting population.—Spain, England.—Mr. Malthus, &c.

HAVING stated some opinions and authorities for and against populousness, I shall add some of the direct contradictions and by inference made on this subject by the same nations and the same writers. In 1548 the French government published an ordinance absolutely hostile to the multiplication of the people; and in 1572 the Hugonots were massacred, and "the king himself in person led the way to these assassinations[2]." Yet in this depopulating monarchy it was a maxim that women were not to be expatriated, "sur le prétexte qu'elles porteront ailleurs les germes de la

[1] This is so flagrantly his position, that Mr. Ricardo, the eulogist of Mr. Malthus, says: "Mr. Malthus appears to me to be too much inclined to think that population is only increased by the previous provision of food;—that it is food that creates its own demand, that it is first by providing food that encouragement is given to marriage,—instead of considering that the general progress of population is affected by the increase of capital, the consequent demand for labour, and the rise of wages; and that the production of food is but the effect of that demand." Political Economy, p. 561.

[2] Hume, vol. 6. p. 205.

population et de la fécondité [1]." What contradictions did not Louis the Fourteenth exhibit! He revoked the edict of Nantz, while he exempted for five years from severe charges all those who were married at twenty [2].

His Christian majesty has been exceeded by his Catholic majesty in the opposition of his ordinances to each other. Philip the Fourth [3] in 1623 granted to new married men the privilege of nobility for four years, and the exemptions of the same class to those who had six children. The municipal regulations of Castile promoted the same effects by the same provisions:—yet Jews and Moors were swept off by the same government; and as these transferred with their persons—capital, industry and art, the loss of numbers in their expulsion became a permanent deficiency.

The English government has few pretensions either to better principles or to a more consistent policy. Many laws have been made for the preservation of the people. In the reign of Henry the Seventh, much land passed from tillage to pasture; it was then enacted that houses of husbandry with twenty acres of land should be upheld: and by the 25th of Henry the Eighth no one was permited to have more than two thousand sheep. Barrington [4] says the statute is still in force. Again, how dolorous were the reflections respecting inclosures, which Hume [5] admits depopulated the country! Lord keeper Coventry directed the judges

[1] Pastoret des Loix, partie 2. p. 115.
[2] Voltaire, L'Histoire, &c. chapitre "Gouvernement intérieur."
[3] Townsend's Travels in Spain, vol. 2. p. 34.
[4] Ancient Statutes, &c. p. 412.
[5] History, vol. 6. p. 44.

of assize to "make strict inquiry after depopulations, inclosures—a crime of a crying nature, that barreth God of his honour, and the king of his subjects; church and houses go down together[1]." Yet the system of England in many ways advanced pasturing at the expense of tillage, and thus by necessity men were displaced by sheep.

Consider the hostility of the laws in the same code in other particulars. He who killed another, *se defendendo*, forfeited his goods; "because thereby a true man was killed[2];" yet for centuries thousands were annually executed by the law, and the value of a true man's life was about a shilling. As to the judicial law[3] of the same period, that Heretics, Jews and Turks should not have their clergy; this was common to all Europe, when faith was strong and priests despotic.

In England, many laws have been made in favor of marriage; by one[4] in the reign of Edward the First, it was ordained that lords should not keep possession of female wards if they did not marry them when they were sixteen. The 5th of Elizabeth, c. 12. s. 4. enacts that "every badger lader, kidder carrier, buyer and transporter of butter, cheese, corn or grain, shall be licensed, unless he is a married man." Yet bonds for procuring the marriage of persons are declared void[5]; and marriages[6] and births were assessed;—for a duke's marriage fifty pounds, which was reduced as the indi-

[1] State Trials, (Irish edit.) vol. 1. p. 566.
[2] Law Dictionary, vol. 2. p. 228.
[3] Ibid. vol. 1. p. 500.
[4] Reeves's History of the Engl. Law, vol. 2. p. 111.
[5] L. Dict. vol. 2. p. 411.
[6] Ibid. vol. 1. p. 398.

viduals declined in dignity. Thus Acbar favored marriages and taxed them[1]; and thus the government of Tonquin was at once friendly and hostile to the marriage of its people[2]. Blackstone also remarks the contradictions of the English code, by favoring, if not compelling, the marriage of the father of a natural child with its mother[3]; and the numerous restraints, especially to the union of the lower classes[4], which he says is evidently detrimental to the public by hindering the increase of the people.

The laws of England are self-destructive on this as on various subjects:—they fix the wages of labor, tax the necessaries of the industrious, impose the same law on the ingenious and enterprising, and on the inexpert and doltish, localize individual exertion;—all these are inimical to the increase and comforts of society: yet if we should believe British rulers, they have been most anxious for the populousness of the country, and the greater population of a village, town, or district, has often been proclaimed by them as the triumph of their own ability and virtue. I must observe, however, that their conduct is not peculiar:

[1] Ayeen Akberry, p. 248.

[2] According to Hamilton, "the greatest nobles thought it no shame or disgrace to marry their daughters to English or Dutch seamen for the time they were to stay at Tonquin." Pinkerton's Voyages, &c. vol. 8. p. 484. Yet the tax which legalizes marriage at Tonquin amounts to twenty-three crowns. Exposé Statistique du Tunquin &c. par M. M—n. [3] Commentaries, vol. 1. p. 455.

[4] Ibid. p. 438. Dr. Halley lamented the difficulties the people encountered in entering the marriage state.

Colbert [1] endeavoured by recompenses to increase the people, but he prevented the commerce of grain; which is not much less incongruous than the English law of settlements, which limits the commerce of labor and the intercourse of mankind. Thus legislators have not merely controverted by their practice sound policy, but traversed their own projects and wishes. So have authors, whose errors of contradiction are infinite, and none certainly in this respect has exceeded Mr. Malthus: he says [2], "It is an utter misconception of my argument to infer that I am an enemy to population,—I am only an enemy to vice and misery." In what region, in what state, in what age does he not exhibit the misery of mankind? What is the burthen of his theme?—That population "presses so hard against the limits of their food [3], that their population pressed so hard against the limits of their means of subsistence [4]," which he frequently repeats [5]. Does he not involve all savage and civilized societies, all states ancient and modern, every European nation now existing, "except perhaps Russia [6]," as laboring under this pressure? Distress so clings to mankind in his system, that the sum of his philosophy is, Man and misery,—no matter whether many or few, whether thronged in cities, united in towns, cultivating the earth, pasturing herds of cattle, hunting nature's commoners,—in every variety of life, in every shade of being, mankind exceeds the subsistence which the earth affords:

[1] Eloges de Mons. Thomas, t. 3. p. 286. [2] vol. 2. p. 432.
[3] vol. 1. p. 155. [4] vol. 1. p. 165. [5] as v. i. p. 231. [6] vol. 2. p. 69.

No living thing, whate'er its food, feasts there,
But the chameleon, who can feast on air.

In the same disregard of his principles and argument he says, *an increase of population is a great positive good, when it follows its natural order*[1];—and he considers the natural order, contrary to sir James Steuart, multiplication of people in consequence of extended agriculture. Yet what is more broadly advanced by him;—is it not his primary position; is it not the aim of his argument; does it not intervene in his details—that man by nature tends to increase beyond the increase of subsistence, and this with accelerated progression? He states in the beginning of his treatise[2], that *population has a constant tendency to increase beyond the means of subsistence.* To the same effect he says, "the *tendency*[3] to early marriages is so strong that we want every possible help that we can get to counteract it." Here this natural tendency is so strong that it requires, according to him, a double check. Is this tendency natural or not? Will he say it is unnatural?—Yet it is to be counteracted by every possible means, he says, because it is pernicious. And yet Mr. Malthus also says[4], "We cannot but conceive that it is an object of the Creator that the earth should be replenished; and it appears to me clear that this would not be effected without a tendency in population to increase faster than food: and as without the present law of increase the peopling of the earth does not proceed very rapidly, we have undoubtedly some reason to believe that this law is not

[1] vol. 2. p. 212.
[2] vol. 1. p. 4.
[3] vol. 2. p. 55
[4] vol. 2. p. 239.

too powerful for its apparent object. The desire of the means of subsistence would be comparatively confined in its effects, and would fail of producing that general activity so necessary to the improvement of the human faculties, were it not for the strong universal effort of population to increase with greater rapidity than its supplies."

Mark this passage. What becomes of his praise of population when *it follows its natural order?* which order in the last quotation he insists is not the order of God's providence; for God impressed *a tendency to population faster than food;* and that this advance of population was necessary to improve the human faculties and people the earth.

Hanc deus et melior litem natura diremit.

The contradictions of Mr. Malthus multiply on every separate topic. He talks of the wisdom of the author of nature, "which is apparent in all his works[1];" and again[2], "the laws of nature which are the laws of God." Yet how grievously he charges with evil these same laws in the following words[3], that "though human institutions appear to be, and indeed often are, the obvious and obtrusive causes of much mischief to mankind, they are in reality light and superficial in comparison with the deep-rooted causes of evil which result from the *laws of nature* and the passions of mankind:"

Est operæ pretium duplicis pernoscere juris
Naturam.

This is truly a new way of reasoning from nature's laws to nature's God. But it certainly proves one po-

[1] vol. 2. p. 447. [2] vol. 2. p. 452, Appendix. [3] vol. 2. p. 24.

sition of the Professor of Political Economy in the East India College,—that the subject of population *is yet in its infancy* [1], if he be the master of the art.

These contradictions and repugnances of Mr. Malthus I here mention to justify for the present a passing observation on his defects; for I shall hereafter, when I investigate his theory, exhibit numerous inconsistencies in his Essay. The reason of this sad deficiency in this writer has proceeded from different causes. Having originally, as appears to me, no very commanding mind, with moderate learning, and, by his own avowal in respect to this particular subject, very limited knowledge; he fastened a theory on a dispute, and thus advanced opinions which he had not ingenuousness to retract, and dared not defend. Finding on consideration that his original doctrine was narrow and false and hideous—for what could be more false and monstrous than that population was only controlled by vice and misery?—he attempted to restore its credit by adding moral restraint to the insolvent firm of his philosophy. And in order to keep these partners in tolerable society, he laboured to reconcile antipathies and harmonize discord. Thus his contradictions have increased with every new edition [2]; till in some instances, as in that already noticed, of increase and supplies, tendency and natural, and nature and God; they resemble a certain glorious creed. I know no-

[1] vol. 1. p. 25.

[2] Mr. Malthus has lately published a fifth edition, in three volumes. The advertisement speaks of additions, (they may be had in a separate volume,) not corrections. I always quote the fourth edition unless I specify another.

thing on this side the Limbo of vanity to which his antitheses in error may be more aptly compared, than that puzzle in legerdemain by which liquors of different flavours and different colours are drawn from the same vessel and the same orifice.

CHAPTER V.

Contradictions and exaggerations of writers principally in consequence of ignorance of facts.—Ancient estimates of different countries and people.

THE causes of the errors and exaggerations of writers respecting population, though no doubt depending in some measure on laxity of mind and a passion for extravagance, are mainly referable to their ignorance of facts. Who with any acquaintance of actual surveys could believe or relate the reputed forces of the Persian army? I do not say with Richardson, that no such expedition to Greece was ever undertaken; nor that the forces of Xerxes were inconsiderable:—his dominions were extensive, and his people obedient. But who can believe the versifier [1], who stated that at Thermopylæ four thousand men encountered three millions! or the historian [2] himself,

[1] In Herodotus, lib. 7. c. 228.

[2] Herodotus, lib. 7. c. 60. He states the ships at 1,207. c. 89. This is not impossible. Herodotus says that the Greek king ascertained the number of his forces thus, 10,000 men were comprehended in a certain space, which was repeatedly filled, &c. lib. 9. c. 60. How much this tends to corroborate the amount, I leave to the reader. It is not much worse than calculating a nation by its fighting men, or an army by its regiments; even though we should not credit that Tyrconnel's regiment was composed of one man.

who sums the Persian's land army at 1,700,000? This number might not have been enrolled; they might possibly have been embodied in parties through the territories of the great king. Yet why should we suppose that Xerxes was more cordially followed than a modern sultan, whose captains of a thousand men seldom command five hundred, which for many reasons soon decline to a tenth of their titular amount? Such dashing statements I should not stop to expose, if they did not reappear in modern authors to justify their enormities. Chateaubriand in his *Essai Historique*, &c. states that the Persians killed at Platæa amounted to two hundred thousand; adding, "*mon calcul est modéré.*" If so, every Persian was destroyed; for Herodotus[1] says that the whole number of Persians, Greeks, and confederates, who fought for the barbarians, did not exceed three hundred thousand men; and certainly one-third of that army was not Persians. Yet are the multitudinous combatants of Xerxes, considering the mighty success of his power, an ordinary array in comparison to the innumerable throng of warriors which limited districts and towns armed against each other. Sibaris sent three hundred thousand men against Crotona, which rival city met the assailants with one hundred thousand[2].

The same superlative enumeration is not unfrequent in other particulars connected with population. Homer says that Crete had a hundred cities (ἑκατομπολιν); in the Odyssey they amount only to ninety; and as it is a religious duty to preserve a great poet's veracity inviolate, Strabo[3] accommodates

[1] lib. 9. c. 32. [2] Diodorus Siculus. [3] lib. 10. v. 2. p. 69.

the variation by saying that Homer spoke of Crete at different periods. Stephanus[1] ascribes to Laconia a hundred cities: and it is remarkable that Crete and Lacedæmon, which had so many traits of actual resemblance, concurred in this casualty. As tracts of land had a hundred cities—cities had a hundred gates. Messene[2] seems to have had innumerable gates. Let this be true or fictitious, Wallace, in his endeavours to prove the populousness of ancient states, refers absolutely, as to a notorious fact, to the account of ancient Thebes; saying[3], "it is celebrated by Homer for its hundred gates, out of each of which marched two hundred men with horses and chariots." Nor does he stop till he affirms that Thebes was "more than twice and a half or perhaps thrice as populous as London."

Wallace should have known that Diodorus Siculus[4] says expressly that a *hundred* gates meant many gates[5]. Nor is it uncommon to use a definite number in order to excite an hyperbolical conception. Thus we read of the hundred islands[6]; of the cistern at Constantinople of a *thousand columns*;—yet long since the thousand columns have been reduced by

[1] De Urbibus, p. 76.

[2] Εστι Πυλος, προ Πυλοιο, Πυλος γε μεν εστι και αλλος. Plutarch. Moral. p. 404.

[3] Pages 43, 44. 2d edit.

[4] lib. 1. Mela says that the gates of Thebes were differently interpreted;—Sive, ut alii ajunt, centum aulas habent, totidem olim principum domos. lib. 1. c. 9.

[5] This definite number sometimes regards a particular sum, as the days in the year. Thus Balbi speaks of a great city near Sora which he was told had 366 gates. Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 9. p. 395.

[6] Herodotus, lib. 1. c. 151. It is said "Maledives" signify a thousand islands.

counting them to three hundred and thirty-six. Thus we read of the building in Java of a thousand temples. And so of ten thousand others.

Herodotus [1] relates that wonder-working Egypt had in the time of Amasis twenty thousand cities. Yet according to Theocritus [2], when Ptolemy reigned, Egypt contained thirty-three thousand three hundred and thirty-nine cities. Had the poet described their population and extent, these no doubt would have been as extravagant as their number. Babylon of course enjoyed its wonders—walls three hundred feet high, and a hundred massy gates of brass: yet it is not the least extravagance in the story, that this city when besieged by Cyrus [3] contained provisions for all its people for twenty years duration.

Among the vast and populous cities on record is Nineveh. God said to Jonah, "Should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, in which there are more than six score thousand persons that cannot discern their right hand from their left?" On this text Wallace writes [4]: "According to the Book of Jonah there were one hundred and twenty thousand children in Nineveh, who could not discern between their right hand and their left hand. Now computing according to the proportion, which is, from the most accurate observations, found to be most consistent with truth, and reckoning such as were too young to discern between their right hand and their left to be all those who were below two years of age complete, the inhabitants of Nineveh were two millions two hundred thousand;

[1] lib. 2. c. 177. [2] Idyl. 17.

[3] Xenophon Instit. Cyri, lib. 7. p. 190. [4] p. 332.

if they were below three, the inhabitants of Nineveh were more than one million five hundred thousand; and if below four, above one million one hundred thousand; and if all below five, they were more than nine hundred thousand: thus populous was this exceeding great city." So spoke Wallace, a man not unlearned. Yet this statement enforces another conclusion,—that this exceeding great city was inhabited by an exceedingly insensate people: it contained, as we cannot doubt the authority, one hundred and twenty thousand persons who could not discern their right hand from their left. Yet it is mentioned as a circumstance lamentable and astonishing, that in London [1] one hundred thousand individuals are without the means of education.

Yet this account of Nineveh is moderate, when compared to the numerous Jews who according to Josephus [2] assembled at Jerusalem at the feast of the passover, amounting to twenty-seven millions. If so, there were twenty-seven times more Jews at Jerusalem than there were individuals in the Champ de Mars, near Paris, at the confederation,—the greatest assemblage of people that Europe probably ever exhibited. I saw it.

Nor is this the only relation concerning the Jewish people and their astonishing numbers. The Jews, exclusive of the tribes of Benjamin and Levi, sent forth one million five hundred and seventy thousand men: if so, the fighting men of all the tribes

[1] On the authority of Mr. Allen, stated in the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on Public Education.

[2] De Bello Judaico, lib. 7. c. 18.

amounted to one million six hundred and ninety-one thousand men [1]; which enumeration is only less by nine thousand men than the host composed of many commanded by the great king; and this population was contained on an area of one hundred and fifty miles long by about fifty broad; that is, on a territory, not the most fertile, whose superficies was about one sixth part of the extent of England. Wallace, referring to this topic, concludes: "As we cannot but admit that Palestine was of a very small extent, and the accounts of its numerous armies are taken from Scripture itself, and their numbers are expressly asserted in several different parts of it, all concurring in that particular with each other; this fact will have a peculiar force, and almost determine this question with such as acknowledge the authority of Scripture."

The populousness of other nations, but in rather a mitigated tone, has also been glorified. Milton speaks of the "populous North," and Scythia and many people were associated notions through all ages, even to the present time, when sir W. Jones, under its new title of Tartary, by a mise able and tenth-told simile repeats the vulgar error [2]. Yet Herodotus [3], whom some treat as a romancer, questioned the populousness of Scythia; and Aristides [4] called it a solitude.

[1] 1 Chronicl. 21. See Wallace, p. 53.

[2] He compares the many warriors it sent forth, to those who issued from the Trojan horse. Asiatic Researches, Preliminary Discourse, p. 12. Giannone uses the same figure of the academy of Pontanus, lib. 28. p. 426. Storia di Napoli. Tiraboschi employs it also in his History of Italian Literature:—In short, it is common property among the Della Cruscans.

[3] lib. 4. c. 81.

[4] Των Σκυθων ερημιαν. Orationes, t. 2. p. 225.

Germany has also been reputed the *officina gentium*; yet the Germans had neither cities nor villages: their houses were dispersed and insulated; a circumstance which Tacitus, a resident of Rome, where fires were common and destructive, conjectured, might have been adopted as a remedy against such casualties. And as this surmise was not amply absurd, Mr. Malthus[1] having stated it, adds with confidence from his own fancy, that this dissocial mode of raising their dwellings "is strongly calculated to prevent the generation and check the ravages of epidemics." If so, we might conclude that a *chancery of health* was an appendage of the shifting savage state. Tacitus to his supposition for the singleness of their houses—"*sive adversus casus ignis remedium*," adds, "*sive inscitia ædificandi.*" Thus it is questionable if the inhabitants of this populous country had talents to build two houses under one roof. Nor does it appear that this *populous* country was more advanced in the time of Marcellinus[2].

The Gauls also were *tremendously numerous.* Cicero[3] speaks of their immanity and multitude, and immediately interrogates "*Quid illis terris asperius, quid incultius oppidis*[4]*?*" Their cities had no resemblance to existing cities, if Strabo[5] is an authority. And yet Montesquieu[6] considered that in the time of

[1] vol. 1. p. 130.

[2] Eorum urbes sunt nemora; latissimos enim circos dejectis obstruunt arboribus, ubi constructis tuguriis. &c. lib. 4. p. 364.

[3] Opera Omnia, t. 2. p. 512. [4] p. 511.

[5] Oppida ut circumdata retiis busta declinant. lib. 16. c. 2.

[6] Lettres Persannes. Lettre 108.

Julius Cæsar the world was fifty times more populous than when he wrote; from which even Wallace[1] recoils.

Nor was Great Britain without its claims to populousness. We have no definite account of its towns and cities and people when king Bladud reigned, but he was a great philosopher, and lived about nine centuries before our æra. Julius Cæsar, however, speaks of the *infinite multitude* of men in this island. The facility with which rude tribes collect, their hideousness and disorder[2], might excuse his falsehood, if we did not know that Cæsar assailed Britain in order to forward his schemes at Rome, and that the same policy directed his narrative. How could Britain then have been populous, when some of its inhabitants were as barbarous as the Agathirsi? Maitland will not admit that his countrymen painted their bodies; and perhaps he would also have denied Herodian's[3] testimony concerning the iron hoops about their necks and waists, which Herodian says they consider ornamental, and display as other barbarians do gold—to signify their opulence. Yet Whitaker[4] says, *Caledonia* means a wood; and I doubt if southern Britain was much better than a wilderness also. They had neither cities nor tillage[5]. How could Britain be populous? One barbarous country may be populous

[1] p. 35.

[2] Thus Cicero speaks of the immanity of barbarians and their innumerable multitude. t. 2. p. 567.

[3] lib. 3. p. 200.

[4] History of Manchester, p. 439.

[5] Μητε πολεις μητε γεωργιας εχοντες. Dion Cassius, lib. 76. c. 12.

in respect to another; but in reference to an agricultural nation it must be unoccupied. Yet such is the effect of confident assertions repeated, that sir W. Temple, a scholar, a philosopher, and a statesman, however incongruous the union may appear, affirmed that ancient Britain "was filled with infinite numbers of people[1]:" adding, "they lived most upon milk, and flesh which they got by hunting: little upon corn, which was not in much esteem or plenty among them. In short, they resembled the Germans[2] and other barbarians in their mode of living; and were of course few in numbers, because their means of living was scanty, half-naked, and ill lodged. I cannot refrain from noticing the mass of absurdities which the respect and adoration of the oak has occasioned. Jewish[3] patriarchs, druids of Germany and Britain, have honoured that tree. Why? conjectures are infinite. The reason probably is, it sheltered them, it fed them:— those then who held that men sprang from oaks, only erred by inferring that what supported life caused it, merely mistaking the nurse for the mother.

Spain also has been reputed as swarming with inhabitants. Cicero[4] characterizes Spain by its numbers. I. F. Rehfues, librarian to the late king of Wurtemburg, in a work published in 1809 computes the population of that peninsula when inhabited by the

[1] Works, vol. 2. p. 530. Shaftesbury, a man very inferior to Temple, speaks very irreverently of our barbarous ancestry. Miscel. 3. c. 1.

[2] Agriculturæ non student; majorque pars victûs eorum in lacte, caseo, carne consistit. Cæsar de Bello Gallico, lib. 6. c. 21.

[3] Genesis 35. 4. Joshua, 24. 26, &c.

[4] Nec numero Hispanos, nec robore Gallos, nec calliditate Pœnos, &c. De Harusp. t. 2. p. 431.

Moors at seventy-eight millions. Mons. Say[1] thinks it formerly contained twenty-four millions, and that now it contains only eight. I do not believe it ever contained twenty-four millions, and it is more probable that at present its people are eight than ten or eleven millions, according to other estimates[2].

The population attributed to towns is still more exaggerated than that ascribed to countries. Mons. Laborde says Taragon contained two millions of people. Isaac Vossius, who only allowed to all ancient Europe thirty millions of inhabitants, insisted that Nankin formerly contained twenty millions. And Wernerus Rolefinchius[3] computed ancient Rome at twenty-seven millions. Thus enormities proceeded, as I have said in the beginning of this chapter, principally from ignorance of facts. As investigation detects lies, surveys reduce numbers. The Helvetii, by the census found in their camps, amounted only to 368,000 persons, men, women, and children; which is not thrice more than the present population of the Pays de Vaud[4];—yet what multitudes would have been fancied, had there been no enumeration, or had the census merely stated their twelve towns and four hundred villages!

[1] t. 2. p. 155.

[2] Jacob in his Travels mentions a census which states the population at 10,351,075, in 1803.

[3] This brave calculator I only know through Keysler. Travels, letter 47.

[4] They were 112,951 when Price wrote on Annuities, &c. p. 286.

CHAPTER VI.

Attempts of authors, from want of facts, to ascertain the population of states by hearths, families, taxation, houses, marriages, baptisms, births, burials; by fuel consumed; by food eaten; by churches, by cobwebs.

As most rulers have been remiss in improving the science of government, and as many have considered that their dominion was secured by the ignorance of the people, and even by their exclusion from political topics; no direct means of ascertaining the resources of nations, their opulence and population, existed; nor was a knowledge of these circumstances attainable. Curious and patriotic individuals, therefore, adopted by necessity such expedients and substitutes as presented themselves. The first political œconomists in this country resorted to the taxes as some basis for their theories and calculations.

Sir W. Petty, who deserves to be first mentioned on account of the extent of his inquiries and his disposition to establish principles, was obliged [1] to resort to the hearth-money returns, in order to estimate the wealth, stock, trade, consumption: and having ascertained these as well as his opportunities afforded, he calculated the population. Taxation, however, can never determine the number of families; and supposing the families enumerated, this could not establish the amount of the people; for the individuals composing families vary in different nations, provinces, districts, even in the same town. In the Reports [2] of

[1] Sir W. Davenant's Works, vol. 1. p. 128. [2] vol. 2. p. 49.

the Society for bettering the Condition of the Poor, referring to the distressed in Hamburg, it is said: "The whole number consisted of 7391 individuals, and composed 3903 families." Here each family did not contain two individuals. I may observe that this mode of estimating the people by the hearths in far-famed England is inferior to the Tartar census mentioned by Marco Polowhe[1], who says he had inspected the amount of the revenues and of the people of the Great Khan,—that there were 160 toman of fires; that reckoning a family for each fire, every toman contained ten thousand families; that is, altogether, 1,600,000 families. He adds, that every householder had written on his door the names of all the inmates, the number of horses, &c. and that this was the practice in all the cities of Mangi and Cathay.

Sir W. Petty was followed by Davenant, who[2] considered the Excise and the number of houses *no ill measures* to form a judgement of the trade, wealth, and abilities of a country. The supposition would prove the infancy of the science, had he not stated[3] that "the matters we have hitherto handled have been in a manner entirely new, and such wherein very little help could be had from books." It appears that this political writer was also precluded from obtaining any official information: he complains repeatedly[4] that the commissioners of Excise refused him the inspection of authentic documents. In consequence, his

[1] Travels. Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 7. p. 156.
[2] Works, vol. 1. p. 40.
[3] Ibid. vol. 2. p. 168.
[4] Ibid. vol. 1. p. 149. 293. vol. 2. p. 85—168.

conjectures were frequently erroneous. He says[1] himself, that by a computation founded on sir W. Petty's calculation, he estimated that the malt duty at sixpence a bushel would produce 1,050,000*l.*; but by another, and what he considers an improved computation, he rates it at 650,000*l.* Thus erred sir W. Petty and sir W. Davenant; the best computers, according to some[2], that England has produced—and so egregiously were they mistaken by their substituted and conjectural estimates.

It may be thought that, however authors might have erred respecting their conclusions on other topics of political œconomy, they must have approximated the truth when they calculated the population after having established the amount of the taxed houses in the country. On this assumption Davenant inferred[3] that the people from 1600 to the period when he wrote, increased nine hundred thousand. He states[4], that in 1685 there were 1,300,000 houses in the whole kingdom, of which those having one chimney amounted to 554,631. He states also that in 1795 there were in England 1,300,000 families, which he concludes comprehended seven millions of individuals.

The increase of houses being reputed a proof of an increased population, a decrease of houses has been assumed as proving the decline of the people. Under this apprehension Dr. Price[5] complains, "What a me-

[1] Works, vol. 1. p. 197.

[2] Price (on Annuities) said so of Davenant. p. 299. Davenant said the same of Petty. Works, vol. 1. p. 40.

[3] vol. 2. p. 3.

[4] vol. 1. p. 203.

[5] On Annuities: Supplement, &c. p. 299.

lancholy reverse has taken place since [the Restoration]! In 1759 the number of houses in England and Wales was 986,482, of which not more than 330,000 were cottages having less than seven windows. In 1766, notwithstanding the increase of buildings in London, the number of houses was reduced to 980,692. According to these accounts, then, our people have since the year 1690 decreased near a million and a half." The inadequacy of such modes of calculation is manifold. First, it is taken for granted that the taxed houses are all the houses: yet Price [1] himself noticed an enormous disparity between two surveys of London; one making the amount of the houses of this metropolis 85,805, and the other 95,968. In the first the houses and the landlords assessed were assumed to be the same in amount; but many landlords held more than one house:—this is one of the many evils of indirect estimates.

Suppose, however, the number of houses ascertained, still this could afford only a progress towards the knowledge of the population of the state. By what number are the houses to be multiplied? Decker [2] says seven; for, having mentioned 1,200,000 houses, he computes the population at 8,400,000. Brakenridgesays, six [3]; Scipione Mazzella [4], between five and six. Many authors state five, which is the catholic

[1] Note on Expectation of lives, &c. p. 142.

[2] On Trade, p. 11. Appendix.

[3] This was the ordinary computation in Davenant's time. Works, vol. 1. p. 19

[4] He says that the Neapolitan territories contain 2,600,000, and that the *fires* of all the provinces amount to 483,468. Storia de Napoli, p. 324.

multiplier at present. Gregory King[1] and Davenant, between four and five. What can be expected from such guessing, but impertinent authorities for transient dogmatism or continued error?

The number of houses affords no surety even for estimating the population of districts or towns of the same nation. Townsend[2] says, Barcelona has 10,267 houses, 20,128 families, and 94,880 persons: but he also mentions a town in Spain, and there are probably others, which has fewer people than houses. Houses are insufficient, considering them in reference to the same city: Who would calculate the inhabitants of the old town of Edinburgh by the inhabited houses of the new one? The houses of parishes or streets are insufficient premises for estimating adjoining parishes or contiguous streets. In Calmet's Buildings, in Mary le Bone, by a late report made to the House of Commons, it appeared that twenty-four small houses lodged nightly seven hundred persons. What disparity between these and the palaces in their neighbourhood, where half the year they are empty, or haunted by an old butler or a decayed waiting-woman!

Houses may increase without any equivalent increase of people. When the citizens of London added a house in the west part of the town to their city residence, London was not populated according to the increased ratio of the houses built. Houses may decrease without any proportional decrease of the people. When landlords destroyed many cottages in or-

[1] He supposed that a million of houses contained between four and five millions. Davenant's Works, vol. 2. p. 176.

[2] Travels in Spain, vol. 1. p. 86.

der to enlarge their domains, or to lessen the poor rates as they thought, they filled the poor houses, one of which contained the inmates of many cottages. Again, noble mansions have sunk under accumulated taxation, and smaller houses are decaying: yet this declension does not define the reduced population; for many householders have only moved into boarding houses:—the reduction of houses then is to be considered a wasting disease, not a mortality accomplished.

Houses may continue the same, and the people increase rapidly. In the Western Islands and in the Highlands, the inhabitants have increased from five to six and seven to each house; nor should I be surprised if the same now occurred in France. How many more people would the houses of the count of Blois and Chartres have lodged under a better government than the ancient monarchy?—It is said he had a house for every day in the year. Under equal laws, these with their territories, which were lost on one, would have been enjoyed by many. On the contrary, houses may continue undiminished, and the people disappear. When the French seized Holland, though no houses were beaten down, the population of Amsterdam fell from 220,000 to 190,000. In Megara[1], containing above a thousand houses, little more than one half of them are inhabited. Yet travellers and theorists argue from houses to population, when there may be more houses than families or even than individuals. The Jews at least guarded against this ab-

[1] Hobhouse, Travels, p. 479.

surdity in some measure, by limiting its extent, a habitation [1] being restricted at least to the dwelling of three persons.

Yet notwithstanding the disparity between houses and people, and their relative fluctuation according to times and seasons [2] in the same country, writers assume the amount of the population of foreign states by some loose conjecture concerning their houses. Van Egmont [3] said that Florence contained 8,800 houses, or 60,000 inhabitants. Boswell [4] stated that in 1729 there were in Corsica 40,000 families which paid a tax to the Genoese; thence he rates the people at 200,000 individuals. Eton [5] supposes that Constantinople never contained much more than 300,000 inhabitants. Mr. Hobhouse [6], assuming that the registry of the houses in 1796 was exact, concludes that 88,185 houses must have contained 500,000 inmates. Laressa says, Holland, by computation, contains 4000 houses and 20,000 inhabitants. Salt [7] computes the houses of Adowa to be 800, and their inhabitants 8000. Passing easterly, the same varying estimates are assumed. In *Le Nouveau Voyage à Bassora* [8], Ismid (Nicomedia) is said to have 50,000 houses and 300,000 inhabitants. Buchanan [9] says that the census from the Cutwal made the houses of Seringapatam

[1] Habitatio non est dicenda nisi tres simul inhabitaverint. Selden de J. G. &c. lib. 2. c. 5. p. 182.

[2] In Paris there is little emigration in summer; much more from London; and still more from Moscow.

[3] Travels, vol. 1. p. 32. [4] Travels, p. 164.

[5] Survey of the Turkish Empire, c. 7.

[6] Travels, p. 889. [7] Travels, p. 424. [8] p. 9.

[9] Pinkerton, Travels, vol. 8. p. 605.

4,163, the families contained in them 5,499, and he multiplies the houses by five.

Thus, in this summary, we perceive the calculation by houses varies, without any sufficient grounds, from four to a house to ten; and these random calculations are sometimes made without attention or memory. I am pretty secure in this reproof; for it has happened that the same author in different parts of the same work varies his own calculations. Wallace[1] states, "Xenophon says that Athens contained about ten thousand houses, which on an average of five inhabitants to a house amounts to 50,000:" yet subsequently he writes[2], "According to Xenophon there were 10,000 houses or families in Athens; allowing therefore seven to each family, there were 70,000 Athenians who dwelt in the city:"—this is to calculate as Falstaff fought.

To assume the number of a people by the amount of their houses, is conjecture; but to infer the number of a people in one country by conjecturing the amount of their houses, and then to use this diluted guess to resolve the amount of the population of another country, is worse than romance. In some countries, a great portion of the people live without houses. Buchanan[3] speaks of a tribe in India who have neither houses nor cultivation, who catch birds and game which they barter for rice. Bruce speaks of a people who live one part of the year under trees, and in another on them. At Naples many sleep abroad. Even in London, according to Mr. Colquhoun, not a few are houseless.

[1] Note on page 55. [2] p. 298. [3] Pinkerton, vol. 8. p. 576.

Again, some houses are confined, as those of the Bosjesmans, which consist of a mat of rushes thrown over two cross sticks; the houses of the Crim Tartars [1] consist of a single room, as do those for the most part at Nanking [2] and Pekin; yet these confined habitations frequently contain more inmates than large dwellings. Again, in some towns houses are of one story, in others of many. Bernier [3] remarks that the houses of Delhi and Agra are low, and that at Lahore they are lofty. Houses are also in some places piled aloft; those at Rome were often seventy feet high [4], yet those of Tyre were still more elevated [5]. Houses of many stories are also differently appointed: in some places each story contains a family or more, while at Jonnina [6] the lower chambers are occupied by the cattle; and perhaps for some such reason, at Messina [7] the higher the lodging the more fashionable the residence. The houses even of Paris and London afford no knowledge interchangeably of the population of these cities [8].

To all these and many more considerations are to be added the state of society and the habits and peculiarities of cities and states. Supposing that Olympio-

[1] Chardin: Pinkerton, vol. 9. p. 144.

[2] Nieuhoff: Pinkerton, vol. 7. p. 248. [3] Pinkerton, vol. 8. p. 208.

[4] Strabo says they were by law not to exceed this height. lib. 5. p. 429.

[5] Domos altiores fieri quam Romæ. ibid. p. 530.

[6] Hobhouse, Travels, p. 68. [7] Cockburn's Travels, vol. i. p. 269.

[8] When Maitland wrote, the houses in London were 95,968, when the population of London was not greater than that of Paris at present. Yet by a new census the houses in Paris are 27,371,—familics, 227,252,—individuals, 715,595.

dorus and Publius Victor assigned a tolerable conjecture concerning the number of houses of ancient Rome, —what city now in Europe is so circumstanced as to afford any basis for a thinking man to estimate its population, when according to Herodian[1], Nero's palace reached the length of the city, and that some householders had many hundred[2] slaves? Yet authors have calculated the amount of the Roman people, and they have succeeded accordingly:—So they have the population of other towns. Erivan, says Chardin[3], is divided into nine wards, and has fifteen thousand houses, and as many shops in the market places, among which are three hundred inns, some so large as to lodge three hundred people: the inhabitants were formerly computed at 550,000. There is a peculiarity also which has not been sufficiently noted:—in some countries the marriage of children causes a separation of the family; while in others, as in Hindostan and China, two and even three generations sometimes continue to occupy the same dwelling:—these variations are extreme. Meares mentions a single house near Nootka Sound in which 800 persons ate and slept.

Population has been assumed not only by general taxation, but by poll or personal taxes. Josephus[4] says that he learned the amount of the people in Egypt by inspecting the books of the publicans who levied the tax. Davenant[5] used the same means, saying that the poll tax in the reign of William and Mary shows *something near the truth* the numbers

[1] lib. 4. p. 208.
[2] Tacitus speaks of one who had 400.
[3] Pinkerton, vol. 9. p. 156.
[4] De Bello Jud. lib. 2. c. 16.
[5] Works, vol. 1. p. 137.

and classes of society. Arthur Young [1] remarks on the mode of estimation by taxes, "that all computations by taxes must be erroneous; they may be below, but cannot be above the truth." This observation is only so far false, that in some oppressed countries taxes are anticipated and sometimes repeated in the same year. Besides, the return of the poll tax or any other tax in a fraudulent government will be accommodated to the service of the passing administration. It has been so in Russia; and the enumerations in 1723, 1743, 1783, are now abandoned as defective. Yet existing English writers adopt the extravagancies of Russian statements. Sir R. Wilson, who noticed that Suwarrow *officially* commanded 70,000 men when he led only 35,000 [2], estimates the population of Russia at fifty millions [3]. Tooke also exaggerates, though he admits that the returns are suspicious, from the small comparative mortality they assign; the deaths being to the living as 1 to 58, though in England they are as 1 to 40. Mr. Tooke's politics, however, harmonize with his philosophy; for among the felicities of this good and great domination, he says [4], "Another striking object is, the uncommonly favourable propor-

[1] Tour in Ireland, vol. 2. p. 199.

[2] Anderson, who wrote between Sir Robert's first and second pamphlet, states the population of the empire at 37,000,000. Were I not afraid of compromising the safety in some measure of some persons, I could relate an extraordinary instance of the passion of *one* Russian minister to swell the supposed numbers of the Russian people, by wishing to influence an historian to belie his narrative. The author communicated the anecdote to me at St. Petersburg, the day the proposal was made to him.

[3] This he has done in two pamphlets.

[4] History of Russia, vol. 1. p. 532.

tion which the males bear to the females, and which seems intended by *nature* as the foundation of the military grandeur of the Russian empire." Thus does this Christian minister use nature, that gadding queen, as loosely as Mr. Malthus. Before I quit this point, let me ask what causes this disproportion,—is it that more males are born? No, but more female children perish. Mr. Malthus[1] has noticed this in the registers of St. Petersburg, adding, "which is directly contrary to what has been observed in all other countries." Not so positively, for Salt makes the same remark relative to the children at the Cape of Good Hope. I should suppose that it was by no means so peculiar as these writers imagine; for though females may be less liable to death than males when treated with equal kindness, it seems probable that they should in every stage of life be less able to resist equal severity. What is the state of many Russian families? The landlord divorces the husband, and forces him from his home to towns, in order to earn the capitation tax; which accounts for the extraordinary male population of St. Petersburg. This capital counts two males for one female. Thus lordly rapacity renders families fatherless:—and may we not conclude that, in a common misery, the weaker, that is the female infants, are the greatest sufferers?

Population has been confidently estimated by marriages: but the proportion of the married and unmarried varies in every country; there is also the greatest difference respecting the ages at which parties unite in

[1] vol. i. p. 357.

different states; and this and other circumstances render great inequality in their productiveness. Marriages may increase, and do often increase, after a great mortality, as in Prussia in 1811; and it sometimes occurs that many marriages infer increased deaths. In Holland, when the marriages were 1 to 64 individuals, the deaths were 1 in 22 annually, according to the tables of Susmilch.

Those who calculate by marriages disregard numerous disturbances to their theory, even if the registry of marriages were accurate. They seem to think that a marriage is tantamount to so many animals *in esse*. Yet in countries where divorces are common, and widows and widowers repeat their connexions, many marriages are contracted by the same individuals, and comparatively few births, perhaps fewer than where divorces are not permitted: besides, marriages between old persons, when two crutches go to make one staff, are not more productive than the marriages mentioned by Marco Polo[1]: "If the son of a Tartar die before he has been married, and the daughter of another die also unmarried, the parents of the deceased meet together and celebrate a marriage between the dead."

To calculate people by their marriages infers extreme regularity in the intercourse of the sexes: yet it appears by the Annual Register[2], that in 1759 there were in London more foundlings than marriages, the former being 4969, the latter only 4089; and in ten years after, the foundlings in Paris were still more nu-

[1] Pinkerton, Travels, &c. vol. 7. p. 124.

[2] Annual Register 1759, p. 165.

merous than in London, being as 6426 to 4860. In France also, the children of unmarried mothers before the revolution were 1 to 47, subsequently they were 1 to 11. There may be a population without marriages, and also without any connexion between the sexes; as the Essenes, who recruited their numbers by adoption; as the Dunkards[1], who, though consisting of males and females, and having common property, admit no sexual intimacy in their society: should any of their body choose to marry, they are provided with necessaries and dismissed. Corresponding to these partly in their consequences are the unmarrying towns and countries, whose stock of people is upheld by drafts from places where men are more prolific or breeding cheaper.

Many have calculated the number of individuals by baptisms: yet in some cases this might prove the burials, as in China, where the missionaries performed this pious office to perishing and abandoned infants, as they said, "*pour leur sauver l'ame.*" And who could now calculate the South Americans, except an adept in the geometrical theory of Mr. Malthus, when the Franciscan friars boasted they had baptized in Mexico and the adjoining provinces in sixteen years six millions of Indians? There are no grounds from this ceremony to draw any conclusion. In Devonshire there is 1 marriage to 113 persons; yet this does not produce more baptisms than Derbyshire, which has not more than 1 marriage to 137 persons: and it produces fewer baptisms than Cornwall, which has only 1 marriage

[1] Annual Register 1759, p. 342.

to 141 persons. Rickman accounts for this by the marriages of the sailors in Plymouth and Portsmouth. So imperfect are baptisms for this purpose, that in the Population Abstracts[1] it has been thought necessary, in consequence of their supposed deficiency, to increase their number by introducing a prerogative arithmetic, and counting seven baptisms as eight children.

Calculations by births are much superior to the conjectures already mentioned. There were such registries at Athens and at Rome. In 1538 Cromwell[2], when he was vicar-general to Henry the Eighth, issued directions for framing such lists. In 1539 Francis the First[3] directed an ordinance to the curates of the several parishes of his kingdom for the same purpose, and registries soon became general throughout Europe. On these the most extensive and positive conclusions have been founded. Muret, on the decline of the births in Swisserland, insisted on the depopulation of that country; and hundreds have assumed that population has increased, because births had become more numerous. Nor is this the whole of the assumption: the decrease and increase have been calculated by guesses. This is the mode adopted by Monsieur Necker[4] in estimating the population of France: he first considered the registries of births as facts extensive as the births; he then multiplied them by 25 and three-quarters, which produced 24,802,580. Yet

[1] p. 24.

[2] Law Dictionary, vol. 2. p. 586.

[3] Causes Celèbres, t. 5. p. 89.

[4] Bibliothèque de l'Homme Publique.

Monsieur de Calonne at the same period[1], and a prime minister also, stated that the population of France exceeded this number by more than three millions. But why calculate by births only? To decide on this partial view, supposes that all who are born in different times or periods live generally to the same age. Yet it is ascertained as accurately as the births and deaths in France, that the chance of living has greatly increased since the revolution;—those who died under the old monarchy being to the living as 1 to 30, and after the revolution as 1 to 40, a fact pregnant with conclusions.

Is it not also obvious that a people may not increase, though the births increase? Catharine of Russia in her *Instructions*, &c. says, "The boors have generally speaking twelve, fifteen, and to twenty children at one marriage; but it rarely happens that the fourth part of them reach maturity." Even should they reach maturity, this would not ascertain a population equivalent to the births; for in some nations life is greatly prolonged, and in others abbreviated after the attainment of manhood, and this abbreviation may proceed from opposite causes. Young men are remarkably subjected to death in St. Petersburg, which is referred to the excessive use of ardent spirits. Life is also comparatively short, according to Turreau and Beaujour,

[1] Le calcul vérifié en 1787 est environ 28 millions. Tableau de l'Europe, p. 10. Mr. Malthus in his chapter on France, &c. perplexes himself and his readers by putting cases and arguing on them. How did it happen that he did not see the work just quoted, which would have decided the question at once?

in the United Provinces of America; which, if true, may arise from the higher premium for increased exertion, and in consequence the greater wear and tear of the laborious. It is, however, contradicted.

A double registry of births and deaths is more likely to afford exact information. Plato[1] recommended this; and he proposed that the names of the individuals should be erased from the registry as they died. It is obvious that the ground for any just conclusion must rest on the accuracy of the documents. Davenant[2] insists on the validity of the present duty (speaking of course of his own time) on marriages, births, and burials; yet he admits the imperfectness of the returns; and he adds, that "Mr. Gregory King, from his general knowledge of political arithmetic, has so corrected them as to form a more distinct and regular scheme of the inhabitants in England, than peradventure was ever made concerning the people of any country." This is extravagant, though Mr. G. King possessed considerable sagacity, and drew admirable results from scanty and imperfect materials.

Suppose the births and deaths minutely specified; these could only express the amount of the population of a town or country which neither received recruits nor admitted emigration, or which received in return people equivalent to its issues. A country or district the emigrants from which were many, as from the Spanish provinces which principally supplied South America with Spaniards, would appear to have more people by the registry of births than it really possess-

[1] De Legibus, lib. 6. p. 877. [2] Works, vol. 1. p. 137.

ed; as a country the people of which was supported by the introduction of foreigners, would appear by the deaths to have fewer inhabitants than in truth it contained: and these errors would increase with the comparative excess. How weak then is Gibbon's lamentation—that no one had left an account of the deaths and births at Rome, as by them, he inferred, the population of Rome might be explained! Rome was so peculiarly situated when it became the metropolis of the world, that these particulars could not have afforded any reasonable approach to a vague generality;—the perpetual resort from the provinces; the many domiciliated foreigners; the multitude of slaves who did not breed, and of freemen who abstained from marriage—utterly excluded the population of this city from being illustrated by any records of births and deaths. In all cases the double entry of births and deaths must prove imperfect; their deficiency is enormously exhibited by a relation from Thucydides [1]. The Athenians, in order to hallow Delos, passed a law that no one should be permitted to bring forth or to die in Delos, but that the parturient and perishing should be removed to Rhenea. It is clear that a registry in Delos would during the continuance of this custom exhibit neither births nor deaths; and of course were such accounts the only authority for estimating population, Delos would be reputed entirely depopulated, while the people of Rhenea, as the births or deaths of the transferred Delians were alternately more or less, would appear to have increased or decreased, though in fact

[1] lib. 3. p. 242.

neither the births nor deaths of the Delians could have altered its population.

Writers have indulged their genius in many other modes of estimating the numbers of people in countries and cities. To the quantity of coal consumed in London some have resorted. If so, the population of the capital doubled from the beginning to the middle of the eighteenth century; for in 1762, 570,774 chaldrons of coals were imported into London [1], and only half as much fifty years preceding. If the comsumption of coals be a criterion, no one existed when timber was the only fuel; which opinion probably would be little more absurd than the terrors of government concerning the deleterious quality of smoke, which induced the ministry of the reign of Edward the First to forbid by proclamation the burning of coals [2].

Some calculate the progress of London population by the oxen, cows, calves, sheep, lambs, pigs, slaughtered for its support: others by the grain consumed; as if there was no difference in the use or abuse of grain in different periods. An Indian political œconomist insisted that formerly Seringapatam contained 500,000 inhabitants in the time of Tippoo, from the consumption of grain in that city. Buchanan [3] treats the estimate contemptuously—yet how much more accurate is his own?

Things the most remote, the most absurd, and the most opposite, have been used in surmising the amount of population—the increase of gin-shops and the decrease of churches have been mentioned. Smith in

[1] Annual Register 1763, p. 64. [2] Stowe's London, vol. 1. p. 2.
[3] Pinkerton, &c. vol. 8. p. 605.

the Ancient and Present State of Kerry [1], infers that the inhabitants of Ireland have greatly diminished, because the barony of Corkagenny contained formerly twenty parish churches, and that at present there only remain nine places of worship. If churches are to direct to similar estimates, how sadly has London become depopulated! When Fitzstephen wrote, London contained thirteen great churches beside one hundred and twenty-six parish churches; yet it is questionable if Mr. Vansittart, in order that "his memory may outlive his life half a year," could raise as many churches for the existing people of London, as, proportionably to its population, consecrated this metropolis in the time of Fitzstephen. If churches direct population estimates, how lamentably has Paris declined since the revolution! Eustace sighs over the churches which sympathized with the fall of the old monarchy; for from 222 they declined to 39,—which I may remark is the exact amount of the churches in modern Athens, where the people are scarcely ten thousand souls. Indeed there is not a more wretched mode of estimating mankind, or their morality [2], than by these buildings. Moses, according to Josephus [3], considered that the chosen people had but one temple and one altar;—yet how miraculous their multitudes! while in Nepaul, according to Colonel Kirkpatrick, "there are nearly as many temples as houses, and as many idols as inhabitants." Such are the estimates on theo-

[1] p. 172. [2] The Abyssinians are the most church-building people, individually, existing. Bruce's Travels, vol. 3. p. 642.—Their virtues are few. [3] lib. 4. c. 8.

logical principles:—while Heliogabalus [1] inferred the magnitude of Rome from ten thousand weight of cobwebs which had been collected in that capital.

CHAPTER VII.

Actual census at Rome—at Athens. Ignorance and errors of Mr. Mitford in consequence of his hatred of Republics, exposed. Errors of Mr. Hume respecting the Athenian census.

YET all countries have not been destitute of actual enumerations of their people. Servius Tullius made a very accurate census. He divided the classes of citizens according to their age[2]. *Pueritia* included all under seventeen years; *Juventus*, those from seventeen to forty-six; and *Senectus*, all those more advanced in life. By this census the people amounted to 85,300[3]. It was extensive, minute, and so accurate that it was a document of great authority at Rome[4]. The census was repeated when Valerius was a second time consul; then the people amounted to 130,000[5]. The same number comprehended the population under Appius Claudius[6]. A census was taken at each lustrum; and Dion of Halicarnassus mentions successively 313,823 390,736—394,336—450,000: such was the progression of Roman people, who however afterwards declined to 137,000, the historian says, in consequence of their repeated defeats by Hannibal. Beside the enu-

[1] Lampridius in Vitam Heliogabali, c. 26.
[2] Taylor, Civil Law, p. 121.
[3] Dion of Halicarnassus, lib. 4. c. 22.
[4] Ibid. lib. 4. c. 5.
[5] Ibid. lib. 5. c. 20.
[6] lib. 6. c. 63.

meration at the lustrum, it appears from Polybius[1] that there was an annual enrolment of all those who attained the military age. Perhaps I should observe that the census did not comprehend children or women: for though Dion of Halicarnassus specifies the number of Sabine women who were ravished, and though the first census of the people under Romulus comprised every individual,—the colony consisting probably of fighting men only,—yet the same expressions are used respecting the population of Rome, after the Romans had families, and refer solely to those able to bear arms[2]. The colony under Romulus, says the historian[3], consisted of 3000 foot and 300 horse; and he speaks of the people at his decease amounting also to 46,000 foot and 1000 horse.

I now proceed to make some observations on the population of Athens. It is interesting in itself, for the Athenians are most interesting in all their relations; it suits the subject; and he who writes on man prospectively to his advancement, and does not aid modern experience by ancient knowledge, fails in half his duty. Besides, the errors entertained respecting the population of Athens are many. It has been frequently said that there had been only two census of the Athenian people: they were numerous, and it is remarkable that in various circumstances the population continued nearly the same. Philochorus[4] in the scholia on Pin-

[1] Ποιυσι δε τυτο καθ' ἑκαστον ἐνιαυτον. lib. 6. c. 17. p. 641.

[2] As Εν ἡβῃ. Dion Halicarnassus, lib. 5. c. 20.—πολιται και τυς εν ἡβῃ παιδας. Ibid. lib. 9. c. 36.—των εχοντων την στρατευσιμον ἡλικιαν. lib. 11. c. ult.

[3] lib. 2. c. 16.

[4] Petit, Leges Att. p. 551.

dar mentions a census in the ninth Olympiad, in the time of Cecrops, amounting to 20,000 citizens. When Demetrius Phalereus ruled [1], the Athenians amounted to 21,000, the μετοικοι to 10,000, and both possessing 400,000 slaves. Herodotus [2] states the Athenians at 30,000; in which he probably includes the μετοικοι and citizens: if so, the Athenians were equally numerous during all these periods. Mr. Mitford, however, insists that in the age of Pericles the Athenians were only 14,040. Unfortunately, however, for this historian [3],—the enemy of the people and the eulogist of tyrants and the Pisistratidæ,—this deficiency was not a depopulation. It is true, the people in the time of Pericles were stated to be 19,000 [4], and at the same period it is also stated that they were 14,040: but though the latter enumeration succeeded a pestilence, it does not appear that the people suffered considerably,—so active is freedom to recruit its losses: for the apparent reduction of the people arose from enforcing a law against foreigners and interlopers at a time of suspicion and danger. On this occasion five thousand persons, who were not born of Athenian citizens by father and mother, were disfranchised. Exactness and impartiality were so sacredly observed, that even Lysias was degraded to the class of μετοικοι because, though he had been naturalized by six thousand citizens, he was not accepted by the senate previously to his admission by the people [5]. Twenty thousand, or nearly that number, seem to have been the amount

[1] Athenæus Deipnos. lib. 6. p. 272. [2] lib. 5. c. 97.
[3] History of Greece, vol. 1. p. 248. first edit.
[4] Plutarch. in Periclem. [5] See Auger, Discours Prelim. p. 8.

of the Athenians at the death of the orator Lycurgus[1], who bequeathed fifty drachmæ to every citizen. His fortune at his decease amounted to 160 talents:—estimating the talent at 60 minæ, and the mina at 100 drachmæ, and 50 drachmæ to every citizen,—160 talents would afford legacies to 19,200 individuals. Demosthenes also, in his Oration against Aristogiton, sums the Athenians at 20,000.

Mr. Mitford is not only in error, but, in his dread of democracies, he slanders the Athenian people and their republic. He says, "of all forms of government democracy is not only the most capricious but the most selfish." And his reason for this dogma is, that Athens "consisting of less than 30,000 citizens should hold extensive and populous territories under subjection[2]." Now this same number 30,000 is the estimate of the British who govern India, and these 30,000 hold 60,000,000 not as tributaries but as serfs and vassals. What does he mean by the selfishness of democracies? Consider the financial arrangements of Athens. Here the poorer classes were wholly exempted from taxation; the burthen fell on the rich, or rather on the richest[3]: while in monarchies, as in France before the revolution, the Athenian policy was reversed, for the nobles were exempted from contributing to the state. At Athens it was esteemed honourable, not onerous, to officiate for a free people. At Athens there were no sinecurists, no pluralists; no one could even hold twice the same magistracy[4], nor two offices in the same

[1] Plutarch. Moral. p. 453. Vitæ Orator. [2] vol. 2. p. 102.
[3] Demosthenes adv. Phœnippum, p. 1023.
[4] Petit, Leg. Att. p. 221.

year. Never did it occur to them that state officers should possess salaries in order to live in splendour: on the contrary, chief magistrates and ministers were ordered to abstain from distinctions in dress, equipage, and entertainment[1]. Archons, judges, treasurers, tax-gatherers, generals or ambassadors, all in every responsible and exalted situation were paid moderately when they officiated, and when they retired from office of course they ceased to receive the public money.

Mr. Mitford says that democracies are most selfish and capricious. Yet the Athenians twice abandoned Athens and Attica, and beheld the ruin of their delightful city, sooner than acknowledge Hippias[2] and the great king. This historian may dwell on popular caprice; yet the Athenians under unexampled difficulties were ruled by Pericles during fifteen years: for the people, said Xenophon[3], will freely obey those, of whose virtue and ability they are assured. Mr. Mitford also descants on *democratical extravagance:* yet the common theme of reproach by the English court critics is the parsimony of the American government. The Athenians were neither parsimonious nor prodi-

[1] Αλλ' ισος και ὁμαλος εσθητι και διαιτη και τροφαις. Plutarch. Moral. p. 40.

[2] This Hippias was not selfish, forsooth; yet he exasperated the Persians, conducted them to Marathon, and in order to resume tyranny under Xerxes desolated his country. In Xerxes we see the magnanimous allies;—in Hippias, Louis XVIII. I may here state an error of Mitford respecting the taking of Athens. He says that all the Athenians that were taken at the assault were put to the sword, vol. 1. p. 393. They were not; and 500 of them were afterwards redeemed from slavery by the Samians. Herod. lib. 9. c. 99.

[3] Opera, p. 764.

gal. Could they be prodigal who adorned the world with eternal monuments of their genius? The fragments of their artists are the models, the admiration and despair, of modern genius:—such were their expenses. For all useful purposes, till a king trespassed on their dominion, they austerely husbanded and appropriated the public treasure:—this people, this sovereign people, resigned their special revenues from the mines of Laurium to equip a fleet. Mr. Mitford speaks of Athenian extravagance, while he details the vast sums stored in their treasury;—six thousand talents in money[1], 1,200,000 pounds sterling. Thus he declaims to the British, whose government is most lavish even while it labours with insolvency. Mr. Mitford, in his aversion to freedom, blunders against all sufferance:—he reviles Athens for the sin of democracy, while he perverts facts to prove that it was not a democracy; for he suggests that the active citizens must have attained the age of thirty, "before which," he says, "they seem not to have been legally competent to vote in the assemblies of the people." On this occasion he praises Dr. Gillies for having "avoided the important question,—at what age the Athenians became competent to vote in the assembly of the people." An author's merit in avoiding an important question implicated with his subject, is rather more doubtful than the paint-

[1] Vol. 2. p. 169. Mr. Mitford has laboured successfully, in the opinion of those who have introduced his History to students, to prove that a tyrant was a bon homme. Yet this author is enraged that the king of Sparta should be obliged to submit to the *tyrannical authority* of the Ephori. (vol. 2. p. 500.) Therefore pre-eminence is odious in five persons elected by the people, but legitimate and good if exercised by an hereditary officer.

er's skill, who, unable to express a passion, concealed the head of the most afflicted character on his canvass.

The mystery seems to me not very involved. The Athenians enjoyed privileges according to their years. At twenty years old, to use an English term, Athenian citizens were *of age*, they were freed from guardianship [1], they might will and even adopt [2]; at twenty they were liable to be enrolled for foreign wars. At this age also they were, I suppose, enabled to vote; for their names were inserted εις τον ληξιαρχικον γραμματειον [3]—and the ληξιαρχοι especially superintended the assemblies of the people, they directed the scrutiny of those entitled to vote, fined those who did not attend, *atque funiculum minio tangentes, per lictores, eos qui in foro erant ad concionem pellebant* [4].

The disparity between the Athenian citizens and those domiciliated at Athens was not by any means so extreme as Mr. Mitford imagines: 30,000 were not the ruling population, supposing the citizens 30,000; for those included only, as I have said, those of the military age, who were not the fourth of the citizens. Dion of Halicarnassus [5], having mentioned a census of the Romans των εν ηβη πολιτων which amounted to 110,000, added, that the females, boys, domestic servants, &c. were three times greater. The free Athenians of a military age represented families which contained, according to the ordinary estimate, 120,000;

[1] Petit, Leg. Att. p. 493. [2] Ibid. p. 140.

[3] Æschines in Timarchum, p. 275. Lycurgus adversus Leocratem, p. 157. Oratores Vet. Græci.

[4] Julius Pollux, Onomasticon, lib. 8. c. 9. p. 401.

[5] lib. 9. c. 25.

and surely they were not less: for Thucydides speaks of the Athenians having 13,000 heavy-armed soldiers; and that the light-armed, the young, and the old able to bear arms, with the μετοικων to guard the city, amounted to 16,000 more; beside 1,200 cavalry and 1,600 archers [1]. If, then, the military citizens were 30,000, the Athenian citizens (multiplying 30,000 by 4) were one-fourth of the whole population.

As Mr. Mitford would reduce the free Athenians to a tenth, in his detestation of democracies; Mr. Hume, in opposition to Mr. Wallace, who rested his argument in favour of the populousness of ancient nations mainly on the multitude of slaves in ancient times, insisted that the census which rated the slaves at 400,000 was faulty by a cypher, and that 400,000 should have been 40,000 [2]; but the Greeks did not count by cyphers. The words of Athenæus, to whose re-

[1] lib. 2. p. 109. And he afterwards says that the Athenians had 10,000 heavy armed foot and 3000 at Potidæa (p. 119). These were Athenians. We read also of their having two hundred and fifty galleys at sea. Thucydides, lib. 2. p. 182. Suppose each of them had 200 men, this would give a population of 50,000. The ship manned by Cleomenes carried exactly 200 men. Herodotus, lib. 8. c. 17. There is another mode of conjecturing the crew of an Athenian galley, by the pay of a *Lacedemonian* galley. Persia granted 30 minæ to each trireme, and this was three oboli a man. Xenophon, Helen. lib. 1. p. 441. This would give, at 6 oboli to a drachma and 100 drachmæ to a mina, three oboli to 200 men for thirty days. In the time of Homer, ships carried from 120 to 50 men at least:—these are the highest and lowest, and, if I mistake not, the only numbers assigned to ships in his *catalogue*.

[2] Mr. Hume should have recollected that, when the affairs of the Athenians became disastrous in Sicily, Thucydides says more than twenty thousand slaves passed over to the enemy, the greater

port both writers allude, are οικετων δε μυριαδας τεσσαρακοντα.

Hume's reasoning is still more erroneous than his emendatory criticism: indeed it is a combination of inadvertencies, of false reasoning and direct contradiction. Having assumed, after Athenæus, that the Athenians consisted of 21,000 citizens, and 10,000 μετοικοι or denizens, and having reduced the 400,000 slaves to 40,000, he argues, "Now these being but the fourth of the inhabitants, the free Athenians were by this account 84,000, the strangers 40,000, and the slaves (calculating by the smaller number, and allowing that *they married and propagated at the same rate with freemen*") were 160,000, and the whole of the inhabitants 284,000:"—a number surely large enough. The other number, 1,720,000, makes Athens larger than London and Paris united. In this passage, Hume assumes, first, that those ancient authors who discoursed on the population of Athens spoke of the city or town only; but in ancient language *city* was synonymous with state. Bryant[1] remarked that Troy in Homer is used occasionally as a town or a district. This narrow and enlarged mode of speaking was customary in all the Grecian commonwealths; and this partially accounts for those errors respecting the population of towns and their extent, so frequent among authors. I may add, it is the cause of the blunders and supposed hopeless difficulties of travellers and

part of whom were manufacturers, και ανδραποδων πλεον η δυω μυριαδες ηυτομοληκεσαν, και τουτων πολυ μερος χειροτεχναι. lib. 7. p. 507.

[1] Dissertation, &c. p. 132.

critics respecting the extent of Babylon: they cannot understand how Babylon could extend to an area of eighty square miles, according to Strabo: but Babylon signified a city and a district, it was rated as one third of the Persian empire—supplying the great king and his army for four months [1]. Aristotle's observation in his Republic [2] is explanatory: he says, "City has different interpretations:—a city is not comprised in the same walls, for Peloponnesus might be so surrounded as perhaps was Babylon, which was rather a nation than a city, some of its inhabitants not having heard of the surrender of the city till the third day." Besides, What is more common than to use the name of a town for the state, when (as Venice) the name of the chief city and the country is synonymous? Athens in the census meant Attica.

Hume, in the passage just quoted, also assumes that *the slaves married and propagated at the same rate with freemen*. Yet this acute and considerate author, in the ardour of his attack on Wallace, argues effectually in the same essay [3], that slaves neither married nor propagated: his words are, "The ancients talk so frequently of a fixed, stated portion of provisions assigned to each slave, that we are naturally led to conclude that slaves lived almost all single." He says again, "Xenophon in his Œconomics, where he gives directions for the management of a farm, recommends a strict care and attention of laying the male and female slaves at a distance from each other; he seems not to suppose that they are ever married." There is

[1] Herodotus, lib. 1. c. 192, 193.
[2] lib. 3. c. 3.
[3] Populousness of Ancient Nations.

then no reason, from these objections, to impeach the census of Athens inserted in Athenæus, which, with the breeding citizens and denizens and the comparatively barren slaves, gave a population to Attica of five or six hundred thousand persons. Athens abounded with artisans, was commercial, eminently maritime. Herodotus [1] mentions that at the battle of Salamis the Athenians had 127 ships, which were reinforced by 53. Thucydides [2] also speaks of their fleet at another period, which consisted of 250 vessels. Attica formed nearly a triangle, whose sides were sixty miles long, with a base of forty miles; it was also peninsular [3]. These circumstances justify the amount of the population assigned to it by the ancient census.

Beside the census alluded to, there were accurate registries of the years and pretensions of the people from infancy onward. The seven ages are of Grecian origin [4]; and these divisions in some measure directed the periods of each man's special registry or enrolment. Children were registered in infancy, they were inserted in the *fratria* from the third to the seventh year of their age, according to Petit's reading [5]. At

[1] lib. 8. c. 1. A very few of the sailors were Platæans, who soon left the fleet. c. 34. [2] lib. 2. p. 182.

[3] Strabo says it was called ακτη, i. e. *littus*, because much of the land stretched along the sea. lib. 9. p. 713. Apollodorus said nearly the same. Stephanus de Urbibus, p. 55.

[4] They were thus distinguished by the Greek interpreter of Ptolemy de Judiciis, p. 166. Βρεφος, παις, μειρακιον, νεος, ανηρ, πρεσβυτης, γερων. Or according to Julius Pollux, Παιδιον, παις, μειρακιον, νεανισκος, ανηρ, γερων, πρεσβυτης. Onomasticon, lib. 2. c. 1.

[5] Leg. Attic. p. 150. Perhaps the registry by the κηφυκης mentioned by Andocides (Oratores Veteres, t. 2. p. 16.) referred to this.

18 there was another registry [1], when the youth began to learn the rudiments of war within the frontiers. At 20, as I have stated, they were registered by the λεξιαρχοι. They were also distinguished at different periods of their age by repeated inscriptions.

But it was not merely the population of the state of Athens, but also the property of the state in its mass and subdivisions, that was ascertained. Solon [2] calculated the amount, and distributed the people into classes, who supported the commonwealth according to their opulence. There was also a continued registry of patrimonial property [3]. All these things enabled their writers and orators to form just estimates; as they possessed a summary of the stock and numbers of this consummate people, whose institutions are a perpetual inheritance to all nations who dare love liberty, eloquence, and the arts.

CHAPTER VIII.

Confusion and contradictions from want of census in European nations, particularly in England and Ireland.—Census of 1801 *and* 1811.—*Domesday book a model.—Though census have been made for wasteful or ambitious purposes, necessary;—should be frequent and elaborate, including land, in tillage, &c.—Guesses of writers concerning territorial extent of Great Britain, the cultivated land, horses, their consumption, &c.*

IMPERFECT as generally are the traditional notices of classical antiquity respecting population, and other

[1] Julius Pollux, lib. 8. c. 9.

[2] Scholia in Thucydid., lib. 3. p. 181. Plutarch. Solon.

[3] Patrimonium et ληξις appellatur. Julius Pollux, lib. 8. c. 9. p. 401.

great questions connected with political œconomy, they are elaborate and exact in comparison to subsequent accounts of many European nations. When Hume wrote those Essays which, with few exceptions, exhibit such rare exactness and sagacity, he was authorized in saying, "We know not the number of any European state, or even city, at present." Hence the most extraordinary positions, and the utmost absurdity and confusion, assailed the political student. Let us state some of these in respect to London and England.

In 604, according to Bede, London was very populous, and the emporium of many nations coming by sea and land. In the reign of Stephen, the historian Fitzstephen mentions, that at a muster of the Londoners there were 20,000 horsemen armed, and 60,000 footmen. In 1606, Coke[1] in his prosecution of Garnet stated that "London had more than 500,000 souls within her liberties." Yet in 1631, according to a survey made by order of the privy-council, the inhabitants of London were 130,178, which Price[2] says was taken a few years after a plague that had swept off a *quarter* of the people. Sir John Treby[3] in his speech for the city of London, on a quo warranto, in 1683, stated, "The city of London is the metropolis of the kingdom, and consists of about fifty thousand citizens and inhabitants."

With regard to the population of England, the difficulties and contradictions are equally confounding. Coke said in the house of commons, that when he was in commission with chief-justice Popham, there

[1] State Trials, vol. 1. p. 286. Irish edit.
[2] Annuities, &c. p. 146.
[3] State Trials, vol. 3. p. 622.

was a survey made of all the people of England, and that there were 900,000 of all sorts. This account, Hume [1] seems to think, obtains some credit from Murdens statement, taken from the Salisbury collections of the military force of the nation when Britain was menaced by the Spanish armada; in which the able-bodied men are rated at 111,513, who with those armed and trained amount to 236,603. He also adds, "Harrison says, that in the musters taken in the years 1574 and 1575, the men fit for service amounted to 1,172,674 [2]; yet it is believed that a full third was omitted. Such uncertainty and contradiction are there in all these accounts." This is true: yet I imagine Hume has in part increased the inconsistencies of which he complains. When Coke spoke of 900,000 of all sorts, he meant men of all sorts able to bear arms; and the estimate alluded to respecting the forces to oppose the Spanish armada, were men actually serving; which Hume indirectly admits. Besides, the 236,603 were only a portion of those who were serving [3]; for the document omitted the whole array of some counties, and also the forces raised on the borders and in Yorkshire, which were reserved for the north. Coke's and Harrison's accounts, then, seem not materially to differ in their gross amount.

[1] History, vol. 5. p. 482.

[2] This number corresponds with that given by Sir W. Raleigh. In 1583, he says, on a view of all the men in England, 1,172,000 were capable of bearing arms. Invention of Shipping.

[3] There is an abstract of numbers of the armed men in the counties through the kingdom, taken in the year 1588, in the Annual Register for 1760, p. 179; but it is so erroneous in parts, that it is unintelligible for any just opinion.

If the government of Great Britain has acted so indifferently towards its people, as to be ignorant and heedless of their amount, it might be instructive, perhaps, to inquire the motive of the omission. Some have hinted that, with so religious a ministry, the curse on king David for numbering the people must have had a considerable influence; which curse, by the by, Bodin[1] says, God inflicted on David, because the king neglected to pay to God (that is the clergy) two drachmas of silver for each person numbered. It may be so; but I rather suppose the British ministry were withheld not so much by the Jewish as the Egyptian theology. The Egyptians, says Plutarch[2], adore the blind mouse, because their priests hold that darkness preceded light.

To these remarks there are very gratifying exceptions. In 1801 a return was made of all the people in Great Britain, who according to the survey amounted to 10,942,646. In 1811 the census was repeated, according to which the people had increased to 12,596,803: and apportioning the increase to the divisions of the island, it appears that in the interval from 1801 to 1811 England's population had increased in ten years fourteen and a half per cent., and Wales and Scotland thirteen per cent. Those who believed, or seemed to believe, that increase of people proves an amelioration of their circumstances, (which is generally true, except, as in Ireland, where the introduction of a cheaper food supplies more with the means of a mere existence; or as in England, where capital was

[1] De la République, liv. 5. p. 504. [2] Moralia, p. 541.

expended as income,) assumed or laboured to confirm the veracity of the two returns. Mr. Rose [1] spoke of the whole imputed increase as demonstrated. But the falsehood of the imputed multiplication of the people between the two periods is proved by Mr. Rickman, who digested the population returns. He says, "the population of Great Britain must exceed the number of persons in the above summary, (of 1801) inasmuch as there are some parishes from which no returns have been received." There are other acknowledged deficiencies. I imagine also that there was some apparent increase of numbers in consequence of the ability acquired by a repetition of the survey, and by an abatement of the people's reserve in communicating the amount of their families. These causes operated in parts of Ireland; in the county of Armagh [2] there was an apparent increase in less than one year (from 1813 to 1814) of twenty per cent. That the people in Great Britain did increase considerably in the interval stated, is manifest: I only object to the amount of the difference between the first and second returns as deciding the measure of that increase.

[1] Speech in parliament, January 17. 1816.

[2] In 1813, barony of Armagh 29,958 in 1814 32,708.
Upper Fews 17,979 —— 19,617.
Lower Fews 16,699 —— 17,294.
Upper Orien 23,358 —— 24,104.
Lower Orien 19,437 —— 19,864.
107,431 113,587.

The other three baronies made no second return, they having complied *formally* with the act of parliament; so that the appa-

The British government, having been so long inconsiderate respecting its population, has of course been still more careless concerning that of its dependencies; and the consequences have corresponded with this neglect;—calculations and estimates and houses and taxes and births and marriages and deaths have fluttered in every direction. Read the following summary of guesses: Sir William Petty in 1641 calculated the inhabitants of Ireland at 1,460,000: and that by the rebellion in 1652 they were reduced to 850,000, "an awful lesson," says Dr. Ledwich [1], "to the disturbers of publick tranquillity." This gentleman should have improved the innuendo, and added, that this lesson was forgotten occasionally by some of the Irish, and perpetually by the British administration in that country. Sir William Petty [2], in the sequel of his calculations, stated that the population of Ireland in 1672 was 1,100,000, and that in 1688 it was 1,200,000. Captain South in 1695 fixed the numbers of the Irish at 1,034,102. In 1740 an abstract was made of the Protestant population by the supervisors of hearth-money, for then the Catholics were accounted naught: and as this abstract was formed from the houses, and these houses were calculated to contain six persons each, I may omit the sequel. Dr. Brakenridge [3] supposed that, when he wrote (the middle of the last century), Ireland contained a whole million, and that hereafter it might possibly contain two millions

rent increase of 6,156 persons in less than twelve months, proceeded from five of the eight portions which compose this county.

[1] Survey of Aghaboe, p. 73. [2] Political Arithmetic.

[3] Philosophical Transactions, vol. 49.

more. Mr. Bush, from various enumerations of houses, and multiplying each by $6\frac{1}{2}$, drew what conclusions he pleased [1]. Adam Smith [2], who wrote about this time, said generally: Ireland contains more than two millions. Chalmers, author of the *Estimate*, states the Irish (in 1791) at 4,193,000. Dr. Beauford, in his *Memoir* in 1792, fixes them at 3,733,320; and Barrow [3], in his remarks on Chinese population, talks of three millions and a half. Authors who have written still later are equally discordant on this subject. Mr. Newenham calculates the Irish at 5,400,000 [4]; Mr. Rickman, [5] at 4,000,000; Colquhoun, at 4, 500,000; while the orthodox Dr. Duigenan, (the representative of the Irish Protestant church in parliament, and the champion of Protestant ascendancy,) calculating by houses and persons and fractions, insisted in one of his anticatholic effusions, that Ireland did only contain, and could only contain, 3,060,000 [6]. Mr. Gray, the last writer on this subject [7], sums the people of Ire-

[1] I shall state the years and houses; they may serve the reader.

Houses in 1754	395,439
1767	424,646
1777	448,426
1785	474,322
1788	621,484

[2] Wealth of Nations, b. 5. c. 3. p. 465. [3] p. 578.

[4] His calculation is nearest the truth: yet from my own knowledge of the census of some of the counties, and from a communication which Sir John Newport favoured me with, the population is probably above six millions.

[5] He says, at the beginning of the last century the population of Ireland was 1,500,000, and that in 111 years it increased to 4,000,000.

[6] Of whom, he said, 1,500,000 were not Roman Catholics.

[7] Since that, Lord Donoughmore, in his speech on Catholic affairs

land roundly at 4,000,000. Amidst all this confusion, a bill was passed for an actual census of the inhabitants in Ireland, and returns were made in 1813. The Irish minister said these were not sufficiently accurate to be presented to parliament. In consequence, the returns were renewed the year following: since that time no questions, I believe, have been asked in parliament respecting the result of these surveys; and certainly no authentic publication has been made to that effect. Thus the government of Ireland, which had been hitherto barren, at last *felt unusual throes*; but, unlike its great prototype in Milton, its first effort was abortive, and its only offspring was still-born.

All this is strange, in a country proud of its liberty and knowledge, and under administrations who pretended (for we must speak in the past tense) to direct the tone of thinking in Europe. Some governments no doubt have countenanced their inertness; as in Tonquin [1], where it is said the numbering a populous nation is considered impracticable; and other kings have equalled our executive in the difficult and indirect methods to divine the amount of their subjects. As Arianthus, who, wishing to ascertain the number of the Scythians [2], ordered every one of his subjects to bring him the point of an arrow, of which he made a vessel so large that it contained 600 amphoræ.

All the Asiatic nations have not been so stupid as the Tonquiners. China has possessed from time immemo-

in 1817, stated the Catholics at 4,000,000, Dissenters, 500,000, Established Church, 500,000.

[1] Pinkerton, Travels, &c. vol. 9. p. 754.

[2] Herodotus, lib. 4. c. 81.

rial an elaborate census; it is specified in Duhalde. Turpin[1] says that there is a census in Siam every year; and the moderate amount of the people taken by him from such documents, favours their accuracy. The Mahometans also, when they conquered Persia, made a very accurate census of that country; so did the Romans of their provinces, and Hearne[2] likens their Itineraries to Domesday-book.

With Domesday-book before the king and the hereditary counsellors of the crown, (and the representatives of the people, as they are called,) England and its dependencies continued without a general census. Yet the government could direct a census of the Protestants in Ireland in 1740, and of the Catholics[3] in England in 1746. An enlarged or liberal census, however, they could not entertain. Yet the Earl of Clarendon[4], when viceroy in Ireland in the reign of James the Second, solicited that the number of tenements in Ireland should be ascertained by application to the clergy through the bishops. Yet this was resisted. Then why should Mr. Hobhouse affect surprise that "the Mahometans never make any efforts to ascertain the exact number of inhabitants in any town or district?" Until lately, the British government in this respect was as unenterprising as the Turks, and very inferior to modern Christian despotism. Howard says that there is annually a census of the population of Na-

[1] Pinkerton, Travels, vol. 9. p. 575. [2] Discourses, &c. p. 123.

[3] In the Annual Register 1767, p. 107, it is said, this was done by the clerk of the house. There was another direction to the same effect from the bishops to the clergy.

[4] Annual Register 1763, p. 253.

ples[1]: yet it has happened that the British government was less alive to the amount of the people of the British empire than his Neapolitan majesty was to the number of his subjects, or a Russian lord to the poll of his boors. At last, an accurate and laborious survey of the population of Dublin was made by the Rev. Mr. Whitelaw[2] in 1798: this suggested the possibility and propriety of a general survey of the people of England. To this public-spirited clergyman, unpaid and unpensioned, we are obliged for executing the least imperfect survey of a considerable population perhaps existing.

Yet were the population as positively ascertained as the individuals of a family, many other particulars should be known and minuted:—the ages of the parties marrying, the periods of greatest mortality, the rela-

[1] On Prisons, p. 117, he quotes one of them in 1777 as follows:

Males	170,574
Females	165,642
Priests	3,303
Monks	4,231
Nuns	6,311
	350,061;

exclusive of soldiers and mariners.

[2] This is far superior to Maitland's of London in 1737, which regarded the houses. The amount of people in Dublin in 1798, including the garrison and hospitals, amounted to 182,370. I may observe that I have now before me *An account of the population of Dublin, by order of government in* 1813, *since completed, arranged and revised by William Gregory,* which makes the total of those within the jurisdiction of the lord-mayor, 165,360. The population of Dublin was calculated by the hearth-money when Clarendon was viceroy: it was of course erroneous: in 1752 the population of Dublin was *estimated* at 200,000.

tive proportion of deformed children [1] to those well-made, &c. Sir James Stewart [2] requires that the state of the different classes should be kept separate, in order to exhibit those which increased and those which declined;—these and many other particulars would be highly instructive. Yet were all this executed, much would remain undone; Domesday-book happily exists, which in many respects affords a model for perfecting a complete census.

Formerly such a record was deemed essential to government. Alfred began a work of this kind about the year 900; William commenced that which exists in 1080, and in six years it was executed: it refers to Edward the Confessor's time, as Alfred's did to Ethelred's. In this the nation is divided into counties, rapes, laths, hundreds, cities, towns, vills; the arable pasture and woodland possessed by each man is valued; the condition of each town, its population, &c. is specified, with the exception of the four northern counties. Yet so little were the British rulers and legislators disposed to follow the Conqueror in his attention to facts, that in laying a tax on each parish, they calculated the parishes in England at 50,000 [3]. And so little were the successors of these legislators disposed to accuracy, that few years have elapsed since Domesday-book was printed by order of the House of Commons;

[1] Those born in Paris are 23,293, of which 132 have some external obvious defect.

[2] Political Œconomy, vol. 1. p. 73.

[3] Hearne supposes the House of Commons was deceived by Holinshed, who quoted Ranulf. Discourses, p. 46.

Parishes and parochial chapelries in England and Wales, 10,674; parishes in Scotland, 921. Population Abstract, p. 15.

and under their auspices it appeared as no reprint of an ancient book ever passed the press [1].

Though I lament these neglects and omissions, it is almost doubtful whether the surveys which have been executed have not been rather injurious than useful; for almost all political estimates and surveys and census, except those in 1801 and 1811 in Great Britain, have been undertaken either from sordid or ambitious purposes. In the Roman state the census was a muster-roll, by which the patricians under honourable terms supplied those armies which conquered and cursed the world. Nor do I see why the registry of children by Servius [2] had any nobler view, or those during the consulate or under the empire [3]. The census of citizens according to their estates, by Servius Tullius, in effect added a prerogative to property beyond its intrinsic influence, and under the show of regulation disfranchised the mass of the people. A Roman Itinerary was a book of rates, to enable the *publicans* to exact tribute of men and money and grain. The same remarks apply to other nations:—the births and deaths in ancient India [4] were registered on account of the tax imposed on each: and we probably are indebted for our more accurate approaches towards

[1] See Reeves's History of the English Law, vol. 1. p. 220, for the particulars of this parliamentary publication.

[2] Dion of Halicarnassus, lib. 4. c. 15.

[3] Capitolinus is wrong in saying, "Inter hæc liberales causas ita meruit, ut primus juberet apud præfectos Ærarii Saturni unumquemque civium natos liberos profiteri intra trigessimum diem nomine imposito"—in M. Antonio.

[4] Idque tributorum gratia et ne bonæ malæve nativitates et mortes lateant. Strabo, lib. 15. t. 2. p. 449.

a knowledge of population, to the taxes or duties on marriages, births and burials, mentioned by Davenant[1]. And what was Domesday-book? Camden styles it *Gulielmi librum censualem*; for its main object was to facilitate the levy of the king's casualties. Such were the Extents in Scotland; as one professedly in the reign of Alexander[2], as another respecting a contribution of 28,000 pounds[3]. That called the *new extent*, in 1365, was effected in order to raise the ransom of David[4]. Kames speaks of another extent, by which 3000 pounds were to be levied to defray an embassy to Denmark. A knowledge of the people's numbers, or of their property, did not proceed from a generous care or becoming curiosity; but from rapacity, which lavished the people's lives and fortunes in vain expense, or childish projects, or ruinous ambition. Such was Domesday-book, such was the Down survey which Sir W. Petty executed by order of government;—the prominent object of which work was to exonerate government from its debts to those adventurers who had assisted in the subjugation of Ireland in 1654.—Considering then the causes which have introduced us to the knowledge of many facts relative to political œconomy,—reflecting that they originated through escheats, forfeitures, duties, taxes, tithes, ballotings, conscriptions,—the advantage of knowledge so acquired is questionable; and certainly most inauspicious have been the forerunners of political œconomy, the last-born of all the sciences.

[1] Works, vol. 1. p. 137.

[2] Chalmers says there was one before this. Caledonia, vol. 1. p. 745. There were many. Kames's Law Tracts, vol. 2. p. 211. Mackenzie's Institutions, p. 123.

[3] Kames's Law Tracts, vol. 2. p. 195. [4] Chalmers, p. 746.

Yet without a survey, general and minute, this science cannot be entertained as it deserves. Occasional embarrassments, temporary success, abundance or scarcity, the folly of one government, the selfishness of another—will make the councils of nations and the opinions of the people fluctuate, or even rush from one extreme to its opposite. With little authentic knowledge principles must be imperfect; and thence the interests of the community are subjected to narrow views of policy, to factions in trade and commerce, to splenetic orders in council, to corn laws, and the like. Is it not wretched that the domain of the empire is unknown, and that of its cultivated land, of its stock, &c., there is not a caballa for mystagogues to guess by? Read their conjectures. Sir John Sinclair[1] computes the acres of Great Britain at 67 millions; Mr. Cary computes them at 55,193,060. In the Bath Society Papers[2] they are computed at 73,258,471; and that of these, 22 millions are uncultivated. Davenant[3] estimated the land in England and Wales at 39 millions of acres. Middleton[4] estimated them as containing 46,916,000. Potts[5] says, decisively, that they contain 32,150,000 square statute acres. Colquhoun in his Essay on Indigence[6] states the acres of England and Wales at 37,334,400; and in a work on the *Wealth*, *Power*, &c., he calculates the cultivated land at 30,620,000. Mr. Brooke, a fellow of the Royal Society, computes the tillage land of England and Wales at ten millions and a half of acres. Mr. Playfair, an editor of Adam Smith[7],

[1] Communications to the Board of Agriculture, vol. 6. part 1.
[2] vol. 12. p. 197.
[3] Works, vol. 1. p. 197.
[4] Survey of Middlesex.
[5] Gazetteer of England and Wales.
[6] p. 27 and 58.
[7] vol. 2. p. 141.

dogmatizes that "the whole arable land in England does not exceed 5,000,000 of acres, which is not above one tenth of the good land in the country." Sir John Sinclair[1] makes the same computation. Yet Gregory King[2] and Davenant[3] computed the arable land at 9,000,000 acres. Middleton says there are 26,000,000 acres in aration. Mr. Pitt of Wolverhampton computes the cultivated land at 26,000,000, and that six millions of acres are waste. The same variations are made respecting the area of Ireland. Templeman computes that its acres amount to 27,457,000; Dr. Grey[4] to 25,000,000; Mr. Grey[5] to 21,000,000; Cruttwell to 19,000,000; Gerard Malines, in his *Lex Mercatoria*, to 18,000,000; Newenham to $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions of square acres; and Dr. Beauford to 11,943,100.

So of other calculations which depend on guessing. One writer calculates the sheep of Britain at 40,000,000; another at six millions; Mr. Lawrence at 26,000,000:—not that Mr. Lawrence who about a century since, in his State of Ireland[6], calculated three wine bibbers to a parish, five ale topers to the same; and that Ireland lost by men who married whores and who lived above their income five thousand pounds annually. In like manner Mr. W. Pitt calculated the horses of Britain at 1,000,000; Mr. Jacob, at 2,200,000. Mr. W. Pitt[7] also computes the consumption of horses at five millions of acres; Mr. Bell computes the same at 16,000,000 of acres. Why are not these particulars brought within the region of facts by actual computation?

[1] Dixon's Introduction, vol. 1. p. 1.
[2] Davenant's Works, vol. 2. p. 216. [3] Ibid. vol. 1. p. 219.
[4] Young's Tour in Ireland, vol. 2. p. 72. [5] On Population.
[6] p. 47 and 54. [7] Board of Agriculture, vol. 5.

Yet England is not more dull and darkling than other monarchies in Europe. The ignorance of the French government of France before the revolution was hideous: some efforts were made during the republic towards political knowledge; and Bonaparte began in 1807 a metrical survey of each *commune*, with a census of the property of each individual. Six thousand communes were so surveyed, thirty-four thousand communes still remain unnoticed. To be sure, a reporter in the French Institution expects from the increasing taste for *Geodesia*, that sovereigns will know the extent of their territories more accurately than landlords the extent of their domains. If they do, they will employ better artists than those who laid down the charts which are furnished at enormous expense to the British navy. General Cockburn says [1] that Cape St. Vincent, as marked in them, is thirty miles displaced; Cape St. Vincent might have challenged more accuracy. I now conclude this chapter, having endeavoured to impress the necessity of actual surveys and specific enumeration. Sir James Stewart [2] long since insisted, "that every plan proposed for this purpose, which does not proceed upon an exact recapitulation of the inhabitants of a country, parish by parish, will prove nothing more than an expedient for walking in the dark." Vauban, who preceded Stewart many years, and who felt and expressed pity for the people and indignation at their oppressors, spoke to the same purpose [3]. He also proposed that there should be every year a survey of the people [4], and every ten years a census of their property.

[1] Travels, vol. 2. p. 131. [2] Political Œconomy, vol. 1. p. 73.
[3] Dixme Royale, p. 216. [4] Ibid. p. 184. He exhibits a table for marking the population, stock, &c. p. 221 et seq.

CHAPTER IX.

Opposition to Mr. Malthus—do not oppose him on the grounds of other writers. Mr. Malthus, though not superstitious, dogmatizes on Nature—Nature's mighty feast, according to Mr. Malthus—his abuse of the people—iniquitous governments and the truly idle, silently or openly supported by him.—The true cause of the distress of the people. Origin of the doctrines of Mr. Malthus—his confusion respecting checks, and the great deficiency of those mentioned by him;—might have added the natural check—the celestial, or religious—the precocious, or fiscal—the philosophical—the magnanimous—the athletic—the proprietary check:—his direct contradictions on this particular—his argument for the increase of the Jews in Egypt miraculous, and contradicts his own theory—his geometrical and arithmetical ratios exposed. That population presses against food, disproved;—the cause of the mistake explained by the situation of Sweden, by the situation of the British.—The poor man's labour far more surcharged than the rich man's property by taxes. Plenty in Britain, but iniquitously divided—given to idle dogs, horses, &c. Mr. Malthus's tendency to increase beyond food, false.—The argument and examples of Mr. Malthus for the pressure of population against subsistence—from war, in the savage state—his eat a village *ridiculed:—he supposes want of subsistence is an inducement to war—disproved by all great events ancient and modern.—Emigration, not from want of food and room, proved by various facts and arguments, and from his own reasoning and assertions—his monstrous contradictions—his contradictions concerning population following the natural order. Mr. Malthus subjects the seasons to man's disposition to inordinate breeding—considers plague, pestilence, famine, as corrective of redundant population. Man's happiness, according to Mr. Malthus, depends on the abundance of his food.—His false and unpopular remarks respecting Siberians and Russia—respecting food, &c.—abuses the people.—People will not breed if fed—even the rich and prerogative orders perish.*

In this chapter I shall expose some of the many errors and contradictions of Mr. Malthus. I have already

noticed more than one, and in the sequel others will occasionally force themselves on our consideration.

This writer has had many panegyrists, and some oppugners. I have professed myself of the latter class; yet I desire not to be mixed with them in respect to the reasons of their opposition. Dr. Jarrold [1] published a Dissertation against Mr. Malthus, in which he says, "of Providence Mr. Malthus seems to have a very vague and imperfect idea:"—and in a less mysterious strain he says, "very few persons have such an opinion of the Deity as to suppose that he would endow with life without providing the means of its support; yet this is the idea that Mr. Malthus holds out[2]." Did Dr. Jarrold ever read of a famine, or drought, or hurricane, or locusts, &c., occasioned by excessive rain?

But the dogma which has been hurled at him a thousand times is, "Increase and multiply, and replenish the earth." These ghostly assailants consider that all are bound to marry and procreate. Had not Mr. Malthus been sheathed in celestial panoply, this weapon from the armoury of Heaven had long since trans-

[1] Dissertations on Man, &c. p. 327. Dr. Jarrold has of course made great advances into the science of Providence:—he finds that *it was never designed* that the inferior animals should die of old age, but be fatted for man's table, p. 231.—*He believes that those places where no vegetables grow, no animals breathe, are useful in giving repose and in restoring the salubrity of the atmosphere,* &c. p. 230: that is, where the atmosphere may *take the air*, and the air of the cities rusticate a little. Dr. Jarrold insists that the religion of Christ and the doctrine of Mr. Malthus *both cannot be true*: p. 252. This is the old artifice; and would have suited Dr. Jarrold better as D.D. than as M.D.

[2] p. 362.

pierced him. I may observe in his favour, that Cumberland[1], in illustrating indifferent from necessary duties, says, "as it is free, now that the earth is well peopled, for a man to live single or married." Neither can I condemn Mr. Malthus, because Mr. Heron and the author of *l'Examen de l'Esclavage* defend the slave trade on the supposed principles of the Essay on the Principle of Population. My objections to him arise from his want of science; his infinite contradictions; his inhumanity; his loud abuse of the people; his silence respecting the hard-heartedness of the opulent; his general indemnity for kings and ministers. His observations are a never-ending dilemma; and though not sick with superstition, he often employs as highly doctrinal a tone as the most devout mystic. For instance: he says, "the laws of *nature*, which are the laws of God, had doomed him and his family to suffer for disobeying their repeated admonitions." From this, one would suppose that man was warned not to breed, by a voice equal to Virgil's Fame. Yet on the contrary, it is a dogma of Mr. Malthus, that there is a tendency in *nature* to increase beyond the means of subsistence. Nor is this the whole; for the denouncement in the Decalogue, of visiting the sins of the fathers on the children, he applies to sinners against his theory; as if breeding were condemned and not commanded. He says[2], "in the moral government of the world it seems evidently necessary that the sins of the fathers should be visited upon their children." I do not perceive the evident necessity of any punishment undeserved. We are, however, obliged to Mr.

[1] Law of Nature, &c. c. 6. and 9.

[2] vol. 2. p. 329.

Malthus for discovering that "Increase and multiply" is original sin and its punishment also.

This is among the rare inventions of Mr. Malthus: and it appears in an edition in which, he says, *he endeavoured to soften some of the harshest conclusions of the first essay*. In the first, he considered neither children nor parents, but full-grown men met at *nature's mighty feast*, at which a straggler obtruded, who is thrust out, for *there is no cover for him*[1]. A mighty feast truly, which could not afford food for one casual visitor. Yet here he holds to his text: for even at nature's feast, to which Mr. Malthus is the purveyor, population presses against the means of subsistence, and the banquet of nature shrinks into a short allowance ministered by a miser. Reduce this figurative language to intelligible prose. By what law of nature do some feast, and many want necessaries—nay want necessaries, that others may feast in spite of nature? By what view of nature, or God, or man, do some rejoice in all the *delicacies of the season*—that is, all unseasonable things;—and others suffer the privations of grain and roots planted in due time and gathered accordingly? There are questions on this subject that have escaped Mr. Malthus. Paley's Philosophy, which

[1] Mariner, in his Account of the Tonga Islands, having told the manner in which, in England, men provided themselves with food —they "laughed at what he called the ill-nature and selfishness of the white people; and told Mr. Mariner that the Tonga custom was far better, and that he had nothing to do when he felt himself hungry, but to go into any house where eating and drinking was going forward, sit himself down without invitation, and partake with the company," &c.; and he acted so, and was treated with the utmost hospitality.

is the text book in our university, and of course not jacobinical, speaks of another *feast* [1], from which, he says, "you would hardly permit any one to fill his pockets or his wallet, or carry off with him a quantity of provision to hoard up, or waste, or give his dogs, or stew down in sauces, or convert into articles of superfluous luxury; especially if by so doing he pinched the guests at the lower end of the table." Yet this is permitted by Mr. Malthus; and the guest so pinched is reviled for not obeying the repeated admonitions of God and nature.

Mr. Malthus says [2] no one has a right to subsistence when his labour will not fairly purchase it. If so, a portion of this man's property is more sacred that that man's life. But suppose the position true, and that a right to subsistence depends on the labour of the individual:—who labour? the rich, the aristocracy, the proprietors of land, the holders of stock, heirs in their own right, and princes by right divine? Here again Paley interposes: "It is a mistake to suppose that the rich man maintains his servants, tradesmen, tenants, and labourers: the truth is, they maintain him." Mr. Malthus may have heard that the strongest spirit is drawn from the poorest grape; but he has not heard that the greatest wealth is produced by the poorest men.

[1] vol. 1. b. c. 4. p. 137.

[2] vol. ii. p. 206. In the sequel, p. 456, he says, "The sole reason why I say the poor have no claim of right to support, is, the physical impossibility of relieving a progressive population." O, most impotent conclusion! Then the poor who exist have no right to subsistence, because by possibility they may greatly increase—then *posse* and *esse* are the same. This was not his reason; it is the subterfuge of afterthought.

Nor God, nor nature, nor law, nor gospel, can divert him from calumniating the people. He quotes [1] St. Paul—"If a man will not work, neither shall he eat;" which he applies to the poor. As if they eat in idleness; as if Paul applied it to the poor, and not to those professed teachers of the gospel who presumed to be fed, and who did not labour in their vocation. By this perversion of the text of the apostle, we should conclude that the poor are non-residents, pluralists, sinecurists, and the like.

Mr. Malthus [2] considers that attributing in any way the distress of the poor to the higher classes of society is a vulgar error, and asserting that they suffer by the mismanagement and prodigality of rulers, is the greatest wickedness [3]: nay, that those who impeach human institutions, for numerous evils to society, are the most successful supporters of despotism;—to which he adds something about *revolutionary horrors*. These are astounding dogmas. He thinks that governments are comparatively inoperative respecting the want and unhappiness of the people [4], and *that it depends upon the conduct of the poor themselves*. Does slavery depend on the slaves themselves? Did it depend on the people in France that the nobles were exonerated from taxes? Does it depend on the Irish peasantry that the proprietors are absentees? or on the catholics of Ireland that they pay tithes to the protestant clergy? Does it depend on the poor of England that they pay for salt a tax thirty times the original cost of the article? Did the British people war on France in

[1] b. 3. part 2. c. 1. p. 266.
[2] vol. 2. p. 215.
[3] vol. 2. p. 297, et seq.
[4] vol. 2. p. 315.

defence of the old monarchy and of its priests and nobles? Do the people who pay the taxes incurred in that war understand *legitimacy?*

Mr. Malthus abuses the people; and against none has he been more unmeasured in his slanders than against the British people. He says of them, "Even when they have an opportunity of saving, they seldom exercise it[1]." Yet amidst aggravated taxation and distress, eight hundred thousand labouring Britons are now enrolled in benefit societies. The fact is, the poor have increased, because the wages of labour have not at all advanced proportionably to the enhancement of the articles of subsistence, and that much capital has been extinguished. As taxes augmented, the necessaries of the people,—their bread, beer, cheese, tobacco, soap, salt, &c.,—were surcharged: and as the taxes pressed unequally, some had their comforts curtailed, others were reduced to a stint; and many, from the crowd forced down into the lowest order of labourers, have been rendered miserable. The poor rates (I speak of course generally) simply return in alms part of those sums which unfeeling landlords, griping priests, the state money-changers, and a rapacious prodigal government have wrested from the pittance of the laborious.

It is necessary to say a few words on the origin of the new school in this branch of political œconomy. When the French monarchy, after centuries of misrule and frequent acts of insolvency, had perished miserably,—and before the league of despots had forced the revolutionary leaders to follow the outrageous ex-

[1] vol. 2. p. 98.

ample of the sovereigns of Europe,—many vain notions concerning government and humanity were fondly taught: the Cumæan song was resung; *Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo;* and the perfectibility of man counted some enthusiastic advocates. We were told that men might outlive the patriarchs, and women exceed in longevity the daughters of ægis-bearing Jove, who according to Hesiod enjoyed life nine times longer than the phœnix. These notions,—whether from devotees or not, whether shaded by superstition or enlightened by philosophy,—arise from a contempt of facts, from self-presumption and conceit, and should be reprehended and repressed. Mr. Godwin indulged in some extravagancies of this kind, in which he was partly countenanced by experimental philosophers [1]. He suggested that mind might obtain absolute mastery over matter [2]; that man might be so

[1] Franklin in his letter to Priestley says, (Feb. 8, 1780,) "We may perhaps learn to deprive large masses of their gravity, and give them absolute levity, for the sake of easy transport. Agriculture may diminish its labour, and double its produce: all diseases may, by sure means, be prevented or cured, (not excepting even that of old age,) and our lives lengthened at pleasure, even beyond the antediluvian standard."

[2] He said that it should happen "that ploughs when turned into a field, will perform their office without the need of superintendence." This is not much more than the *travelling* steam-engines mentioned by Mons. Say with such admiration.

So many extraordinary things have actually been effected by man, that it is almost dangerous to say what he may not effect. Sir W. Temple spoke as the height of phrensy in projectors, the transfusion of young blood into old men's veins, which will make them gamesome. Works, vol. 1. p. 303. Yet blood has been transfused from an old dog into a young lamb, and inversely:—by this process the old dog became vigorous, and the lamb inert and senseless.

spiritualized as to become purely intellectual; that he might increase at will, and be in a great measure freed from distress. These doctrines Mr. Malthus esteemed not only visionary but pernicious: and he, like other doctors, recommended a directly contrary regimen to that hitherto prescribed. If Mr. Godwin, like Dante, presumed to ascend to the sun's orbit by the sole strength of his desires, Mr. Malthus determined to plant him in his mother earth: and what Mr. Godwin considered an emanation of the great spirit, Mr. Malthus reputed a *sloth* in nature, and first and last a merely eating animal. This doctrine affected novelty; and rushing in with the flood of fearful opinions, when the French people had exerted their power, a great population was easily proved a tremendous evil; while the listless and unreforming temper of the great was gratified, when a sage told them that the amelioration of society was contravened by *deep-seated causes of nature;* that men would overbreed, and that this excess could only be repressed by vice and misery[1]. All these things, to be sure, had been stated at large by Wallace in his "Various Prospects," &c.: but these not being assisted, when Wallace wrote, with the terrors and difficulties which prepared them a reception when republished by Mr. Malthus, excited, when first announced, little noise and no apprehension.

Mr. Malthus undertook the subject of population in consequence of Mr. Godwin's "Inquirer." He commenced author not from mature thought, or after profound investigation, but confessedly *on the impulse of*

[1] It is not to be forgotten, that these two were one and the only cause in his first essay.

the occasion[1]. His first essay having a success which might well surprise him, he read, and he enlarged his work. He read, however, not to correct his first loose conceptions, but to support his prejudices. Thence one volume increased in size; it then became two; and two became three volumes, with appendixes and prefaces and notes. Mr. Malthus, however, affirms that he is a corrector of prevailing opinions[2]. He also says[3], "If the principles which I have endeavoured to establish be false, I most sincerely hope to see them completely refuted." Let him be gratified.

In the first edition of his work in 1798, he acknowledged only one check to equalize population and subsistence—"which check can only be found in vice and misery." This was a discovery, no doubt. In his preface to the second edition he says, "throughout the whole of the present work I have so far differed in principle from the former, as to *suppose* another check *possible*, which does not strictly come under the head either of vice or misery." In the subsequent editions, the check "vice and misery" is divided into two checks; and moral restraint[4]—the unknown, the *possible*,—springs into being; and this last-born of his sagacity ranks the first in his system. Yet in this repeatedly improved edition the defects are many. He calls moral restraint the inducement of the dignitary who would rather live a bachelor, than marry and not possess the establishment, and the parade, and the retinue of a certain cast,

[1] Preface to second edition.

[2] b. 4. c. 8. Observe again, I always quote the 4th edition, unless I specify another.

[3] vol. 2. p. 420.

[4] vol. 1. p. 16, et seq.

If this be moral, all the incumbrances of a monstrous fortune are attributes of morality. If this be new, we must forget Mandeville's doctrine of "Vice shaking hands with Virtue." To call a man moral, because if he married he should graduate a minute lower according to the scale of expense and fashion, and therefore abstains from matrimony,—is monstrous. He says he uses moral in its *most confined sense*[1]: I should say rather, indefinitely. It is also remarkable, that *misery*, which is a cause and a co-ordinate check in page 19, is subordinate and an effect in page 20. He has a note on this, which adds to the confusion. The evil of a total change in the machinery of an hypothesis, without altering the sequel, is evinced in this instance: indeed the whole work exemplifies the absurdity of placing three heads on shoulders moulded for one.—To proceed:

Mr. Malthus insists that plants and irrational animals procreate without any regard to the support of their offspring[2]: that is, the moral check does not affect them. As he did not allow this check to man in his original essay, we should not despair but in due time he will extend it hereafter to the humbler tenants of the earth[3]. Who does he mean by irrational animals? or in his philosophy are all animals, except man, irrational?

[1] vol. 1. p. 19. [2] vol. 1. p. 3.

[3] I offer the following instance to his attention; and, if true, it is the most effectual check of which I have read:—"But it happens when they [vipers or winged insects in Arabia] are incited by lust to copulate, at the very instant of emission the female seizes the male by the neck, and does not quit her hold till she has devoured him." Beloe's Herodotus, b. 3. c. 109.

Passing by this large exclusion, I imagine that his three checks, even with his interpretation of the moral check, will not comprehend all the obstructions to the increase of mankind.

Mr. Malthus notices the want of ardour in man in the savage state[1]: and as he affirms that the passion between the sexes is so equal, that it may be considered in algebraic language a given character, there is a corresponding want of ardour in the women of that state. Here then is a mighty and an original check to population omitted, as not included in his checks; for this deficiency of passion is not referable to morality, or vice, or misery. Mr. Malthus might call this the *natural* check,—the term is his own.

Under which of the three checks does he place the following? A person in India having become a *guru* "when he pleases may marry; but he is thereby degraded from becoming a portion of the divinity, and from his power: and no one has yet been found so desirous of marriage as to relinquish these pre-eminencies[2]." Should not this be called the *celestial* check? And I doubt if Origen (who according to Eusebius[3] emasculated himself because he read in the gospel, "There be some which make themselves eunuchs of men for the kingdom of heaven's sake,") should not be classed under the same exalted designation. Origen's situation was not singular: The priests of Cybele[4] in Phrygia were actually castrated. In modern times

[1] vol. 1. p. 44.
[2] Buchanan. Pinkerton, Travels &c., vol. 8. p. 634.
[3] Præparatio Evangelica, lib. 6. c. 8.
[4] Herodian, lib. 1. c. 40.

priests of certain religions are equally abstinent, though they do not by such absolute proofs ensure their virtue.

Mr. Malthus says that "a rich and commercial nation is by the *natural* course of things, led more to pasture than tillage." Now tillage supports more people than pasture[1]. Shall we call this the natural, or pastoral check, or both? It cannot be referred to moral restraint, or vice, or misery.

Under what check shall we class the very early marriages of females in some countries; which anticipating the females' vigour, rapidly exhaust their powers. Travellers have observed[2], that in such circumstances women soon cease to bear children. Shall we call it the precocious check?

Under what check are we to range those marriages which are deferred by the operation of duties, taxes, &c., not moral restraint, nor vice, nor misery?—perhaps the *fiscal* check. Swift said, "No wise man ever married." Is this the *philosophical?* Joseph Scaliger refrained from marriage, lest he should have a child that would disgrace his family. This at least should be called the magnanimous. Aristotle says[3], the athletic habit is injurious to generation. Were exercises in Greece immoral, or vicious, or miserable? The conquerors in the games memorialed the year by their names; their glory was a sort of descendible nobility: and Gorgus of Messene[4] by such feats attained the government of his country. Under which head stands

[1] vol. 2. p. 191. [2] Pinkerton, Travels, vol. 11. p. 193.
[3] De Republica, lib. 7. c. 16.
[4] Polyb. Exerp. &c. lib. 7. p. 1368.

emigration? Men emigrate for various causes: but certainly they are not always induced by morality, or forced by vice and misery.

Mr. Malthus says, "It is not enough that a country should have the power of producing food in abundance; but the state of society must be such as to afford the means of its proper distribution: and the reason why population goes on so slowly in these countries (Siberia, &c.) is, that the small demand for labour prevents the distribution of the produce of the soil; which, while the divisions of land remain the same, can alone make the lower classes of society partakers of the plenty which it affords[1]." Here is a check enormous in its operation. Can Mr. Malthus force it under any one of his special checks, with any truth or consistency? In the countries referred to there is confessedly abundance of food; yet the increase of the people is checked by the *small demand of labour*, which he attributes to the disproportionate divisions of the land.—Here, then, this production of food and men is obstructed by the vast inequality of property. To what compartment of his checks is this check adapted? And mark his contradictions. He states[2] that "the principal and most permanent cause of poverty has little or no direct relation to forms of government *or the unequal division of property*; and that as the rich do not in reality possess the power of finding employment and maintenance for the poor, the poor cannot, in the *nature* of things, possess the right to demand them." I tell you again, from Paley, that it is the poor who support the rich; and it is con-

[1] vol. 1. p. 199—200.

[2] vol. 2. p. 422.

trary to *the nature of things* for the rich to demand more from the poor than they can conveniently grant. The question between the rich and poor is not whether the rich should give or maintain, but whether they should take and impoverish. The unequal division of property, in one of the last passages quoted, he says, prevents the produce of the soil and the increase of the people: and yet in the last passage he holds a contrary opinion. And so much does the state of property enter into his œconomical views, that he insists that the specific cause of the poverty and misery of the lower classes of people in France is the extreme subdivision of property in that country [1].

Mark again the effect of the unequal division of property in respect to this subject, and his confusions. He says [2], "In countries where, from the operation of particular causes, property in land is divided into very large shares, there arts and manufactures are absolutely necessary to the existence of a considerable population. Without these, modern Europe would be unpeopled." Here, again, the forms of government and the unequal division of property, which he treated as nought respecting the comforts of the lower orders, are so mighty, that if their perniciousness were not counteracted by arts and manufactures, Europe, he says, would be a desert. So much for his consistency. And under what head of morality, of vice, or misery, are we to class the check of large shares of property, which without arts and manufactures would have left Europe unpeopled?

I have now stated some particular restraints to po-

[1] vol. 2. p. 374.

[2] vol. 2. p. 273.

pulation, which the science of Mr. Malthus has not embraced. I proceed to other particulars of his philosophy.

We come now to his arguments for the disposition of mankind to increase and multiply exceedingly. He says[1], "Population when unchecked (—when did that happen?) goes on doubling every twenty-five years." Yet this rate of increase does not satisfy him: he asserts, "It is calculated that the Israelites, though they increased very slowly while they were wandering in the land of Canaan, on settling in a fertile district of Egypt doubled their numbers every fifteen years during the whole period of their stay[2]." I must ask, is it not alarming to introduce an incident of the adventures of a miraculous people into a political inquiry? What should we think of a Roman who, to prove or elucidate any question, should state that the eight great deities did not multiply beyond twelve[3] for a long time; but when the gods were adopted by all-conquering Rome, they multiplied so surprisingly, that the population of heaven, according to Pliny[4], outnumbered the people of the earth?—should we not think that he spoke pontifically? What has Jewish increase to do with this subject? Suppose that Aristotle, when he said, that in Syria above Phœnicia mules brought forth[5], signified the wondrous fecundity of Palestine,—this would be marvellous, but certainly no

[1] vol. 1. p. 8. [2] p. 556. [3] Herodotus, lib. 2. c. 46.

[4] "Quamobrem major cœlitum populus, etiam quam hominum intelligi potest." Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. 1. c. 6.

[5] Animalium Hist. lib. 6. c. 24. t. 1. p. 882. He also says that in Cappadocia mules are fruitful, p. 1157.

proof of ordinary generation. Yet is the imputed increase of the Jews in Egypt so multiplying and doubling their numbers every fifteen years, that about seventy persons in 230 years increased to 2,500,000[1], a miracle little inferior to the productiveness of mules. That a few slaves, whose pregnant women Pharaoh willed should miscarry, whose men were worked to their destruction[2],—that these in a narrow district of Egypt should increase with a rapidity unknown in any extensive favored country;—nay, that these slaves should equal the whole present population of Egypt, if Volney's[3] calculation be near the truth,—is an exaggerated miracle. Truly Mr. Malthus might as well have proved his argument for bounties on the export of corn by the supply of quails and manna in the wilderness[4]. The multiplication of these *miserable* slaves in Egypt (I use misery as Mr. Malthus does) is so mighty a miracle, that Mr. Robert Atkins, in his Compendious History of the Israelites lately published, endeavours to explain it with the help of the Talmud, by a surplus produce of females among them, and thus assigning eighteen women to each man: if

[1] Josephus says it was not easy to count them, but that the fighting men were 600,000, lib. 2. c. 14, 15.

[2] They complain in the Old Testament of making bricks without straw. Josephus says they were employed in cutting canals, building walls round the cities, and ramparts and embattlements and pyramids.

[3] His estimate is 2,300,000.

[4] Mr. Malthus insists that population cannot be very rapid, except where the price of labour is very high (vol. 1. p. 288.) It would be satisfactory to learn the wages of these slaves—surely none ever obtained so much!

so, they resembled the herds of Augeas [1], who became more prolific every succeeding year, and fortunately produced many heifers, θηλυτοκοι τε. Such is one of the proofs or illustrations afforded by Mr. Malthus of the disposition of man to increase most rapidly, and who chooses to be pleasant on Mr. Anderson, by an innuendo on the *well-known infidelity of the age*. Besides, Mr. Malthus forgets that this increase in Egypt, if considered historically, must impugn his theory respecting the pressure of population against the means of subsistence, and that population runs an accelerated course, while food follows step by step. All this shows little depth of management in the author: this is not merely to fly a paper kite, but when it is aloft to cut the string of the toy. It would much more have consorted with Mr. Malthus's repeated terrors, to have inserted, instead of this generative wonder, another document from the same source, "And it came to pass, when men began to *multiply* on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that *wickedness* became great on the earth [2]."

He says, "population has this constant tendency to increase beyond the means of subsistence [3]." To make this statement very imposing, he avers that population increases in a geometrical, and food in an arithmetical ratio, which might be summarily denied by the oracular answer ουτ' εν αριθμῳ. This perversion of the terms of an abstract science has deceived many. He proceeds [4], "The rate according to which the productions of the earth may be supposed to increase, it

[1] Theocritus, Idyl. 25. v. 125.
[2] Genesis 6.
[3] vol. 1. p. 4.
[4] vol. 1. p. 9.

will not be easy to determine. Of this, however, we may be perfectly certain; that the ratio of their increase must be totally of a different nature from the ratio of the increase of population. A thousand millions are just as easily doubled every twenty-five years by the power of population as a thousand; but the food to support the increase from the greater number will by no means be obtained with the same facility." Suppose so; what fact is told, what truth is taught, what conclusion is realized or approached, in consequence?—I can perceive no good in any such supposes. Wallace indulged himself in exhibiting the geometric increase of mankind in the antediluvian world, amounting to 206,158,430,208: "Thus we see," said Wallace[1], "to what a prodigious multitude mankind must have increased in 1200 years:" yet he continues that there was no such increase, nor could it be; adding, "it is easy to institute a calculation according to any assumed hypothesis." Should we follow Mr. Malthus in *supposing*, we might invert the terms, and assume that food increased beyond the people by a transcendental geometry. If Mr. Malthus supposes that a thousand millions may be doubled every twenty-five years by the power of population, I may suppose that the food of man may be doubled a thousand times in the same period: a herring has 40,000 eggs,[2] a cod fish ten times that number[3]. But without re-

[1] Populousness of Ancient Nations, p. 8.

[2] There are lakes, *peuplés d'enormes poissons*, and which are equally productive as sea fish. Yet a project was offered to the academy of Berlin to increase the fecundity of salmon trout.

[3] To this the following verse might be applied:

Φυλον αμουσον αγουσα πολυσπερεω καμασηνων.

Plutarch. Moral. p. 550.

sorting to the ichthyophagi or going beyond the earth [1], it appears that in 1788 two bulls and three cows strayed away in New South Wales, who in seven years increased to a herd of a thousand:—Now men live on fish, and flesh, and grain. As to "the incredible increase of a barley-corn," I refer the reader to the treatise of M. P. Knetczmer, counsellor of state to his Prussian majesty. Suppose the power of generation in men equal to the increase of the Jews in their sad captivity, or greater still, we may suppose that the animals which they eat are more disposed to generate [2] as is the food of inferior animals, who live on shrubs, plants [3], grain, &c. more apt to increase than the animals themselves. I say, I may suppose on these suppositions, that the food of man may multiply far beyond the possible multiplication of man; that is, one extravagance may rebut another; or rather, that two puerile hypotheses may perish together.

"The constant tendency of population to increase beyond the means of subsistence." What is meant by tendency? Is it the disposition of the sexes to each other? Is this the signification of the term? Yet this tendency is countervailed by other tendencies as pow-

[1] Reaumur proved that an aphis may have twenty generations in one year, and that in five it may be the parent of 5,904,900,000.

[2] "Bestiæ hominum causa generatæ sunt, nedum bestiarum causa arborum fructus, et terræ fruges, et tot rerum copiæ comparatæ sunt." Cicero, t. 4. p. 238. Herodotus says that animals which serve for the purposes of food, to prevent their total consumption, are always very prolific. Thalia, c. 108. Derham might use this in the chapter on the balance of animals in his Physico-Theology.

[3] Mr. Malthus does not seem to have advanced far in the science of natural history when he stated, "No one can say why such a plant is annual." vol. 2. p. 17.

erful. This tendency in some is felt and repressed, or suffered, and is unproductive:—the connexion of the sexes in London, for instance; where Mr. Wallace seems at least to have had no faith in his geometrical increase of mankind, which he derived perhaps from the descent tables of lawyers. It may here be remarked, not only how these two authors differed from each other, but how Mr. Malthus differs from those who originally estimated man's increase; Sir William Petty[1]; Davenant, &c. the first of whom supposed a doubling possible in ten years. Yet Davenant calculated the actual increase in England at 9000 a year, or a million a century; and this Sir James Stewart[2] considered preferable to a more rapid multiplication. Gregory King[3] supposed that in 1260 the people of England was 2,750,000, and that these doubled in 435 years; that is, at the close of the 17th century they amounted to 5,500,000, which are the exact numbers assigned by Davenant[4] to England at that period. Gregory King supposed the next doubling would be in 2300. Sir William Petty[5] conjectured that Ireland in 1169 contained 300,000 inhabitants, who he fancied in the ordinary course of increase became in 500 years 1,200,000[6]. These inven-

[1] Polit. Arithmetic. [2] Polit. Œconomy, vol. 1. p. 75.
[3] Davenant's Works, vol. 2. p. 176.
[4] Works, vol. 1. p. 197. [5] Polit. Arithmetic, p. 14 or 24.
[6] Mr. Grahame says "that the population of every country has a tendency to increase beyond the quantity of food with which the country actually supplies its inhabitants, appears to be a position which his (Malthus) adversaries should be as little willing as they can be able to controvert." Inquiry into the Principle of Population, p. 102.

tors or original supposers of the greatest possible increase in a few years, never speculated, never talked of a continuation of this increase;—that was reserved for Mr. Malthus, who attempts to dignify with great practical importance his geometrical increase and arithmetical supply. I marvel he did not invoke nature on the occasion,—nature and arithmetic are ancient allies: *Εννιοι γαρ την Φυσιν εξ αριθμων συνιασασιν.*

Had Mr. Malthus amused himself by mooting a vexatious question or a mere paradox, he should not have been disturbed by me: but his argument is instigated by something more than a mere scholastic pruriency. If the propensity to increase be so predominant, how happens it that any portion of land is uncultivated? If the infusive force (to use Thompson's language) be so irresistible, if its potentiality be so enormous, and that while we breed like giants we must feed like pigmies;—what could prevent the land from sudden and universal cultivation? Or, viewing the question in another light, how does it happen that the same people grow rich as they grow more populous, and live better as they increase in numbers? There is an account of Harmony in the Philanthropist: the colony so called consisted at first of a few who fled from Germany: they began with 20,000 dollars; yet they have increased immensely by generation and by new settlers, and yet their capital is now thirty times greater than their original stock.

It is strange that Mr. Malthus could have persisted in maintaining his ratio of increase of food and population, as in the beginning of the series they are directly the reverse. Suppose the population doubled

in 15 years; as this doubling implies a new country, the land brought into cultivation [1] might have been quadrupled or more in the same time; and this increased cultivation might have continued until population began to thicken in the land. This has happened in the United Provinces of America; the population has increased extremely, yet the food and all the comforts of life have outrun the population.

Yet Mr. Malthus persists in his ratios; and he is so far consistent, that he reaffirms the general pressure of population against subsistence: so intently does he enforce this point, that we may rejoice we are not declining daily in stature and in all our animal functions, as lowland horses on being mountain fed, from heavy cattle dwindle to ponies. I really wonder he did not help his argument for the immemorial pressure, by some accounts of man's gigantic paternity. St. Augustine determined that the antediluvians were of colossal magnitude, on the credit of some fossil bones of the larger beasts, which his want of knowledge of comparative anatomy ascribed to man before the flood. Hakewell would also strengthen the theme by his remarks on triple births in olden time. While the great

[1] Turnbull says, "It is easy for agriculturists in England to ask why the Brazilians, or why the Americans on the Ohio or the Mississippi, do not pay more attention to their crops; why they do not break up more land, or endeavour by the methods used in Europe to procure larger returns: the reason is, because there are no markets. Why, for example, should a colonist trouble himself with ploughing or digging ten acres, when he gets as much from five, as himself, his family, and his pigs and cattle require, and there is no market for what remains, all his neighbours being in the same situation?" Voyage &c. p. 49.

Linné would add irresistible weight to the pressure of Mr. Malthus. Linnæus[1] believed "that Adam and Eve were giants; and that mankind from one generation to another, owing to poverty and other causes, have diminished in size."

Let us investigate the truth of this pressure; let us consider its amount in the country of Linnæus. Sweden makes a considerable topic in the review of nations by Mr. Malthus: he says[2] it does not produce food for its population. First let me observe, that hitherto Sweden has been in what Mr. Malthus would call an *unnatural* state; it possessed Livonia, and it depended on that province for large supplies of grain[3]. This country became annexed to Russia, and thus the farm of the state was reduced. Sweden also possessed Pomerania, and it monopolized all the corn exported from that country. But suppose Sweden had never commanded either Livonia or Pomerania, the import of grain is no proof of want of food: Venice before she possessed *terra firma* did not raise a stalk of grain, yet her own people had plenty of provisions; and even the refugees from Apuleia, when that city was besieged by Attila, were hospitably entertained by the Venetians.

No country could be more favourable for the theory of Mr. Malthus than Sweden; the land is sterile, the climate austere, and subject to occasional excesses. Yet what is here the amount of this pressure? According to Cantzlaer, Sweden uses 440,000 tons more grain on an average than she grows[4]; but by the same

[1] Lachesis Laponica, translated by Sir J. E. Smith. [2] vol. 1. p. 329.
[3] Annual Register, 1769, p. 10. [4] Malthus, vol. 1. p. 329.

account 400,000 tons of grain are consumed in distillation. If then the spirits procured from these 400,000 tons be unnecessary, the pressure is only equivalent to 100,000 men, four Swedish tons of grain being the apportioned food for one man. This deficiency is not alarming. Suppose, however, that every pint of spirits is to be considered as so much food; suppose also, that Sweden exported no fish [1], we can abate the pressure by other considerations. The burthensome *corvées* which the possessors of certain crown lands are obliged to perform, are so pernicious, that the obligation to supply post-horses [2] only, occasions a waste of labour to the farmer, both of men and horses, annually, equal to 300,000 tons of grain. If the loss, then, by these *corvées* were prevented by a better administration, the deficit of grain by this single improvement would be reduced to 100,000 tons, equivalent to the pressure of 35,000 individuals. Could not Mr. Malthus have made a further advance into politics, and transferred this diminished pressure by charging it on government rather than on geometry and propagation?

Could he not have conjectured that the disproportion between the food and the people of Sweden might be as truly referred to the love of dominion in their kings and nobles, as to man's love of the sex? Have not the Swedish kings pressed on national subsistence beyond the pressure of 35,000 individuals? and yet the burthen of the Swedish nobles was still more intolerable;

[1] It is said the fisheries produce 300,000 tons. Much of this is exported.

[2] Malthus, vol. 1 p. 340.

for in 1682 an extraordinary diet of the clergy, bourgeois, and peasants, in order to humble the despotic nobility, conferred on Charles XI. absolute power [1]. Who can calculate the pressure against subsistence by the perversion of labour and the immense impositions of Charles XII.? Would Mr. Malthus estimate the pressure of this sovereign at less than 100,000 men, considering the men raised and the funds exacted for their support? At what mark on the political barometer shall we graduate the incumbency of Gustavus III., the most hypocritical, *politic* young king on record? From his progress a greater arithmetician than Mr. Malthus could with difficulty reckon how many lies go to make one despot [2]. What was the pressure of his successor, our applauded ally; his civil misrule, his endless wars, his perpetual failure? Yet Mr. Malthus while this man ruled, lamented [3] —what? that the people of Sweden are continually going beyond the average increase of food. This is the view of Sweden by a collegiate professor of political œconomy. The people overbreed, and they press against subsistence; when these people (I have also been in Sweden) endured a pressure, of which a detail of the *peine fort et dure* can alone afford some intimation.

Strange as it may appear to Mr. Malthus, man may be made miserable not only by overbreeding, but by forcing the vigorous into armies, by exacting provisions, by endless taxation, by rapacity and waste, by wars, by court pageants, by castle building, by sup-

[1] Mably, Droit Publique, t. 2. p. 235.

[2] His deeds and words are stated in the Annual Register.

[3] vol. 1. p. 334.

porting grand operas and the like,—all these were inflicted on the poor inhabitants of this cold and barren country. When these miseries are considered, Mr. Malthus might as well declare against the overbreeding of a ship's crew, men only being aboard, who being robbed by pirates endured short allowance during the remainder of the voyage.

Let us consider the question of pressure under another view: let us dismiss the operation of misgovernment entirely from the argument, and let us make England the groundwork of this study. First, I must state, that I do not say there is no misery in England; on the contrary, I am satisfied that it is urgent and extensive. Yet I say, there is no grievous pressure by population against subsistence. When we talk of population and subsistence, we should consider all the people and all the food. Then, if the sum of one does not exceed the sum of the other, there is no deficiency. If, however, one-fifth of the people take five portions of food, leaving the other four parts of the population short by so much of their proportion, this is not properly a pressure of population against food. In like manner, if one part of the community force another part to labour while they themselves are indolent, this is not the pressure of labour on population: and supposing we spoke of such tyranny in Egypt or Palestine, we would say; the Jews were oppressed in one country, and the Canaanites in the other.

Without meaning that all men should equally labour or feed alike, though all should be occupied and temperate; without any reference to or apprehension of such rigid equality, I say; the English people do not

receive their share of the public provisions: and however it may shock the arrogance of self-instituted legislators, they do not obtain their rights in the article of food. Man has a paramount right to his property, man has also an equal right at least to the produce of his labour, for labour originally determined property. If so, the law should not assess labour more than property. Yet what is the case in England? Mr. Preston calculates that the taxes deduct ten from eighteen shillings of the labourer's wages. Suppose they were less onerous.—How would the nobles and members of parliament rage and declaim at the mention of a fifty per cent property tax? How did they rave when the ministry wished to impose a five per cent property tax on them? and how did they glorify their patriotic exertions in resisting them? Excellent men! followers of Poplicola and the Gracchi,—you would not pay five per cent, but you were satisfied others should pay much more; for while you negatived the ways and means, you passed the estimates. Who can doubt the valour and purity of our house of commons!

If labour and property were equally regarded, property should pay as much as labour; if the labourer paid 10 shillings out of 18, the proprietor or stockholder should pay 1000 pounds out of 1800. This may seem tremendous; yet the terror is not that so much should be deducted from the proprietor, but that so much should be subtracted from the labourer: because what in this case would be taken from the rich man would but end some superfluity; while every shilling taken from the poor one would restrict his necessaries, and cut his means of living to

the quick. This is no fantastic doctrine, it has actually directed the policy of many nations. Under the aristocracy of Rome, property was not merely assessed proportionably to labour; but the laborious were entirely exempted from contributing, and even from war; they were considered as having acquitted themselves to the state by being fathers of families: and in Athens the whole taxation was answered by the rich, and sometimes by the richest [1].

I have therefore stated the question less favourably for the poor than they have been actually treated in some countries. And I am authorized to infer from that statement, that the misery of the poor in England is not of their own making (or breeding, as Mr. Malthus would say); and I also conclude, that if the wants of the poor are overbalanced by the superfluities of the rich, there is no pressure of population against subsistence. Consider the city of London last year. Dreadful accounts of starving manufacturers were commonly confronted in the opposite columns of the same newspaper by grand entertainments, splendid fetes, routs: nor were the East and West ends of the town so distant in that sad year as North and South. The lord-mayor proposed to the *city* that the sum of 1000 pounds, usually expended in a dinner on Easter Monday, should be applied to charitable purposes; on which the Court *resolved unanimously in favor of the ancient custom and dignity*

[1] In times of great difficulty they formed a part of the Roman *levy en masse*. "Asperis reipublicæ temporibus cum juventutis inopia esset,—proletarii (a prole creanda) in militiam tumultuariam legebantur." A. Gellius.

of the city of London ! ! Sic inde huc omnes tanquam ad vivaria currunt; and thus a sum that would have dined 20,000 persons who wanted both dinner and supper, was wasted on a few plethoric citizens. Nor are these propensities confined to either end of London. It may be said of the richer English, what Pelloutier[1] said of the Celts: "No national or provincial assembly was held, no civil or religious festival observed, no birth-day, marriage, or funeral solemnized, no treaty of alliance or friendship confirmed, without a feasting." How in this country it can be said that population presses against subsistence, I cannot understand, when so much is destroyed; for one half of the food on such occasions is burned, exhausted, evaporated—divided between the fire and the air; and then of that which escapes culinary consumption, twice as much is eaten as health requires. Compare then in England those who waste and eat and drink inordinately, with those who live sordidly through necessity, and the pressure on subsistence will be greatly relieved: nor have I any doubt but many more die by satiety than privation. The poor man has complaints, but they are limited by his means; while the retinue of a rich man's disorders equals the extent of his fortune.

> "——— Some by violent stroke shall die,
> By fire, flood, famine, by intemp'rance more
> In meats and drinks, which on the earth shall bring
> Diseases dire."

I think I might rest the argument here against the pressure of population on subsistence in Britain; and

[1] t. 1. lib. 2. c. 12.

if I could only strengthen the refutation, I should not increase the proof. But I must ask, How can the pressure be entertained for an instant by any one who has noticed the beasts which the rich support, for jollity, for whim, for I know not what, by the labour of man, that is at the expense of the comforts of the poor? What shall we say of their dogs? Julius Cæsar was to blame, who, seeing some foreigners at Rome with dogs and monkeys in their arms, asked sarcastically if the women of their country had no children. And it may be thought by those who still call Cæsar god, that he prophetically rebuked Frederic the Great, who honoured dogs and not man with monuments. Mr. Malthus has not abused the dog-fancier: no, it is the man, who, being poor, is so *unnatural* as to dote on women and increase his kind:—had he become a beggar by rearing blind puppies, he had passed uncensured by him. But what are lapdogs and the sportsman's dogs—from king Charles's spaniel to the king's buckhounds led by the duke of Montrose—to the studs of hunters and racers, and the rabble of pampered idle horses which swarm through the land? Do these not press on subsistence? How much do the savage animals corrode and consume of man's food? I speak of those creatures shot and hunted, yet preserved by those who claim a descent from the chiefs of William the Conqueror, and who exhibit the game laws as the title deeds of their inheritance. Nothing is said of this compound pressure against subsistence, which in respect to the effects of population on human food presses or compresses as the vice and screw. One idle horse will consume the food of two men, and he must

be attended also. Mr. Colquhoun has computed that inferior animals consume in Great Britain eleven millions of quarters of grain, and men eighteen millions. Would there be a pressure, if what is wasted on useless beasts was left in the hands of the labourer? I do not say given to the poor, but not wrested from the industrious;—the grain imported is a trifle in comparison to the food of man consumed by useless brutes.

Nothing, however, is said by Mr. Malthus on these topics;—a lady's pug dog, or a hound, or a pointer is unnoticed; but a child too many obtrudes on *nature's feast*. The philosophy of Mr. Malthus, his pressure of population against food, is a new reading of a celebrated parable; it is a tale of Lazarus, omitting Dives and his dogs.

The inordinate propensity of man to breed Mr. Malthus has affirmed in various ways, and with an affected latitude of language. If Mr. Colquhoun calculates the prostitutes at all near the truth, it may exhibit *this tendency* of population to increase, while it does not add one to their actual number; indeed so far is it from adding to the stock of people, that it impairs the powers of generation and the multiplication of the people. There is misery in the world, and poverty; and in many instances children are produced heedlessly and viciously: this, however, does not prove the constant tendency of population to increase beyond the means of subsistence; it evinces at most the improvidence of some individuals; and for one man or woman who produces a child that he or she had not a fair prospect of supporting—many become incapable of supporting their families by ambitious projects, by

prodigality in equipage, buildings, horses; by gambling, by neglect of business, by ignorance of its details, by drunkenness, by company-keeping, by taxes which consume the means of employment and the profits of labour; by wars which fundamentally derange society and its concerns. Yet all these do not amount to an *item* in the philosophy of Mr. Malthus; for to his imputed *tendency of population* the unprovided, the unemployed, the miserable, the poor, are wholly ascribed. This word tendency is so loose and unphilosophical, that it might be applied to the hanging tower of Pisa, or to a weathercock out of order; yet it is an accredited term with writers on population, and they use it much as Mr. Wordsworth does in his Excursion:

> "To hear the mighty stream of *tendency*
> Uttering, for elevation of our thought,
> A clear sonorous voice, inaudible
> To the vast multitude whose doom it is
> To run the giddy round of vain delight."

I am surprised that these philosophers, who can advance into the regions of fancy and apply the terms of the abstract sciences to man and matter, did not, beside over-populousness, meet in their vagrancy with other tendencies. There is a tendency in water to attain its level; yet water will ascend rapidly in certain tubes, but beyond some inches the liquid proceeds no higher. Again: profit is often inversely as the supply, and the profits of a capital decrease with the accumulation of wealth. Thus abundance fixes its own limits, in direct opposition to the misery of Mr. Malthus, and the geometric and arithmetic whimsies

of him and his followers; who, full of nature and wisdom, place man and his means of living in most artificial opposition. There is a boundary to the advance of population, which is common to men and all things: and though I am neither atomist nor necessarian, this common principle operates on man (with others conformable to his constitution), as he is a portion of the universe. Adam Smith and David Hume were not lynx-eyed to see *the stream of tendency*. Hume favoured the populousness of nations as presumptive proof of improved circumstances: and Smith said, that "the demand for men, like that of every other commodity, necessarily regulates the production of man; quickens it when it goes too slowly, and stops when it advances too fast[1]." This, I admit, is stating the question in mercantile phraseology; but it is intelligible and true, where man and industry are not oppressed.

The arithmetical and geometrical ratios are jargon. Where property is equitably divided, and labour free, there will be no tendency but to supply what is wanting. Mr. Malthus pleads for discord: yet where there is neither force nor injustice, all things will repose when rest is necessary, and all will move with the general impulse. This order the ancients called the harmonical.

Yet Mr. Malthus advances far beyond the doctrine of tendency and its presumed consequences: he insists that "population presses against the limits of the means of subsistence[2]:" a mode of expression not

[1] Wealth of Nations, vol. 1. b. 1 c. 8. p. 122.
[2] This he reiterates, vol. 1. pp. 106. 231. 377.

unusual with him. This pressure, he says, has affected mankind in every country, and in all stages of society. In short, it has been so great, so compulsory and desperate, that, advancing beyond Hobbes, who taught that a state of nature was a state of war, he insists, "one of its (war's) first causes and most powerful impulses was, *undoubtedly*, an insufficiency of room and food." This is dogmatism which requires strength and energy to support or even to excuse.—Let us examine the assertion. The first war, we may conclude, began among the pastoral and savage tribes, as they commenced the gradation of society. What could a savage obtain as sustenance by fighting another savage, or by tribe assaulting tribe? The answer of Mr. Malthus is they prosecuted hostilities to eat each other. This approaches the Hibernian story of two game cats, who fought and ate each other, so that the ends of their tails only remained. Now for his documentary proof of this surmise [1]. "The chief of the Amolakis (when they enter into an enemy's country) says to each, To you is given a hamlet to *eat*; to you, such a village.——These expressions remain in the language of some tribes in which the custom of eating their prisoners taken in war no longer exists. Cannibalism [2],

[1] vol. 1. p. 66.

[2] The kindness of Mr. Malthus towards man in insisting on cannibalism, seems doubtful. That there were and are cannibals, I neither affirm nor deny: but it is observable that Herodotus, among all his wonders, confines this act to one people: lib. 4. c. 107. D'Azora denies that the Indians of South America are cannibals. Porter thought that the people of the island of Nukaheevah ate their enemies; he however found he was mistaken. The Samoits were thought cannibals. Pinkerton, Travels, vol. 1. p. 64;—this is contradicted. Ibid. p. 529.

however, undoubtedly prevailed in many parts of the new world: and, contrary to the opinion of Dr. Robertson, I cannot but think that it must have had its origin in extreme want." He therefore presumes that he favours human nature in ascribing this practice rather to hunger than revenge. I wonder he did not advance man to the poetic character of the lion; "for t'is the royal disposition of that beast", &c. His kindness to man equals his ingenuity. Why did he not quote the tale of Saturn eating his children; and of the Essedones [1] eating their parents? But the great god of the pagans was not hungry; and the Essedones ate their parents through piety [2]. Mr. Malthus might have increased the obligation of humanity to him, by noticing the abstinence of the two Sicilians, who after the Sicilian vespers deferred eating the Frenchman's heart to the next flesh-meat day. The story is as well authenticated as Robinson Crusoe and Friday firing in *the name of God* at the *affrighted savages*. Thus Mr. Malthus proves an excessive population among the Indians; and he founds one of his arguments on a word which he supposes has outlived the practice of cannibalism: as if these barbarians abstained from metaphors, who in fact speak only in exaggerated figures. What might not be related of the Hungri, with the solitary instance mentioned by Gibbon of the Hun who squatted on the field of battle and sucked the reeking blood from an expiring enemy? What *gourmands* are the French? *Il mangait tout son bien* is a common expression for prodigality. What a voracious Swiss parson was that, of whom the peasant told

[1] Herodotus, lib. 4. c. 26. Polyhistor. lib. 1. c. 20.

[2] "Hæc sunt apud eos ipsos pietatis ultima officia": lib. 2. c. 1.

Dr. Moore, *Il mange tout notre bled!* At this rate of interpretation the Romans fed on words[1], and the Athenians enjoyed a repast on their own heart[2]. What does the expression of the chief of the Amalekis differ from that of Louis XIV, who directed his generals to make a vigorous impression at first, and subsist his armies on his enemies?

Mr. Malthus is not satisfied with supposing that want of food and room occasioned savage warfare; he infers that the same causes induce the wars in the advanced stages of society: that is, as hunger moved barbarians to war, a good appetite now promotes the hostility of nations. His words are, "And greatly as the circumstances of mankind have changed since it first began, the same cause still continues to operate, and to produce (though in a small degree) the same effects." This opinion truly harmonizes with the chieftain's question to Sir John Malcolm, "How, if there is no plundering, do you support your numerous warlike population?" That piracy was common in ancient Greece, as gang robbery is in modern Greece and in British India; that there were mercenaries who fought on any side in all times, Carians and Cretans and Goths and Brabançons and Switzes and Hessians and Hanoverians—I doubt not: but even of these it does not appear that want of room and food obliged them to adopt so unprincipled and flagitious a profession. Those who were free to choose, embraced this profession through presumption and vice and idleness; choosing rather an excessive exertion than

[1] Edi tuum verbum, says Plautus.

[2] In the Plutus of Aristophanes, ταυτον θυμον φαγοντες.

regulated labour. Neither the regular nor irregular wars, called also [1] *la petite guerre*, of barons against barons [2], afford any supposition that they fought for want of room and food. I know plundering excursions were common in barbarous Europe; and they were at that period, agreeable to the *law of nature and nations*. Thus I have read that Mary Scott was married to Giddy, who "besought his father-in-law to maintain her for some time: with this request he complied, upon condition that he was to receive for her board the plunder of the next harvest moon." Does this exhibit a want of room and food? No: merely licentiousness of life. And what were such plunderings to the feuds and deadly feuds which some thought were peculiar to Scotland, but which, unhappily, have been the effects of enmity and revenge, I might say of disinterested malignity, through all the uncivilized nations of the earth?

Look to Africa: Park [3] speaks of two kinds of wars which resemble the great and less wars of Europe: those resembling the latter, called tegria, "are very common; particularly about the beginning of the dry season, when the labours of the harvest are over, and provisions are plentiful. These plundering excursions always produce speedy retaliation." This statement proves that they arise not from want but wantonness [4]; at least, not because one party has little, but because

[1] Martens, Droit des Gens, t. 2. p. 361. [2] Joinville, p. 342.

[3] Travels, p. 292.

[4] Golberry says, "a thatched hut, the building of which costs nothing, some ells of common linen, and six pounds of millet or rice, every day, are sufficient for lodging, feeding, and clothing a

another has much. Bruce [5], speaking of the Arabs, says that it is customary for them to *destroy* each other's harvests; and that the matamores are granaries under ground, where the inhabitants provide a store eventually to support themselves.

Want is not the cause of war—wars do not originate in order to serve self,—for most wars are injurious, and many fatal ;—they are undertaken from some ancient grudge or present vexation : they are instigated by malice, or passion, or envy : and it commonly happens that those nations which confine on each other are the least friendly. Scotland was in alliance with France, and in enmity with England. The lowlanders and highlanders of Scotland were equally offensive to each other. Thus Humboldt remarks, " in all parts of Spanish America there is a decided antipathy between the inhabitants of the plains or warm regions, and the inhabitants of the table land of the Cordilleras." It is melancholy that a hill or a valley will mark the bounds of hatred and affection ; and that a river or rivulet will be at once the waters of memory or forgetfulness : even a space which fluctuates with the sea's ebb, or which hitherto has existed within the air-drawn lines of longitude or latitude, shall become the object of hostilities, and ultimately involve the universe in war.

family consisting of a father, mother, and four children—Twenty days labour per year are sufficient to ensure an abundant supply of food ; so that the existence of a negro family may be said to be a gratuitous gift of nature, granted without expense or fatigue: hence celibacy is scarcely known in Africa: indeed it is so rare that it attaches a sort of shame to those who adopt it."

[5] Travels, vol. 5. p. 229.

War is still less instigated by want of room and food in civilized than in savage and pastoral societies; yet Mr. Malthus suggests that in them also want of food and room have had a predisposing influence. Every mighty achievement of ancient and modern arms disproves the imputation. Was it for want of room and food that Semiramis made war on the Hyperboreans? that Crœsus, the richest of princes, assailed Persia[1], notoriously poor? that Cyrus[2] sought the miserable Massagetæ, or Darius the Scythians, whose inhospitable country proved his ruin? Was it the want of room and food which induced in any degree Cambyses[3] to make war on three nations at once? Did these causes move Xerxes to collect all the disposable forces of Asia in order to conquer Greece, which Demaratus[4] told him was the child of poverty? or to change the place of onset, did Philip of Macedon make war on the Scythians, impelled or moved by these causes? Ateas their general addressed him: "You rule over the warlike Macedonians, and conquer man; but I and the Scythians conquer hunger and thirst[5]." Did Alexander turn the current from Greece against Asia, through want of room and food? No; this man called *Great*, this oracular brood of Jupiter, fought for glory. "What do I not suffer," said the raging man as he toiled on in destruction, "what do I not suffer to be praised by you, O Athenians?" And oratory by the tongue of Demosthenes crowed Philip and royalty

[1] Herodotus, lib. 1. c. 71.
[2] Ibid. lib. 1. c. 207.
[3] Ibid. lib. 3. c. 17.
[4] Ibid. lib. 7. c. 102.
[5] Plutarch. Moral. p. 105.

as they deserved. Was Pyrrhus stinted in room and food? or is the unanswered question of his minister Cyneas forgotten[1]? Pyrrhus was a hero; peace was insufferably tedious to him:

"For quiet to quick bosoms is a hell."

How is the absurdity of this supposition evinced by the all-conquering Romans! They fought to gratify the patricians, but surely not for want of room; for every effort was made to support the population of Italy by draughts from the provinces; and the land, from being once a garden, became sterile and uncropped: and such, let it be remembered, were the room and food the Romans gained by war and conquest,—the most successful nation that ever existed. War was so entirely the business of the Romans, that Florus[2] should rather have attributed this barbarity to them than to the Dacians.

The motives of conquerors, who are by far the most flagitious of the human race, are not and were not want of room and food. When vengeance or envy did not instigate them, the cause was infuriate ambition, or madder fanaticism. Want of room or food operated neither formerly nor now. Did they move Louis the Fifteenth to make war on Paoli and the Corsicans; or the Corsican to trample over Europe; or Austria to seize a third of Poland; or Russia, while it quarters the world, to add wilderness to wil-

[1] "What hinders you now from not beginning the enjoyment?" Apud Stobæum, Sermo 10, p. 131.

[2] Daci tanta barbaries est ut pacem non intelligant. lib. 4, p. 269.

derness, and Caucasus to Kamtchatka, and California to Finland? Did such motives induce England to war in the West? She fought America that she might lose *3d.* a pound on tea; for while she charged *3d.* a pound *duty* in America, she took off *6d.* a pound on the export of the same article from England. Is she moved by want of food and room to war in the East? She prevents the import of food from the East, and will not admit one of her people to reside liberally in that vast continent. Men do not make war for its supposed advantages[1]: they are not so absurd. Wars are made to excite or gratify the passions.

Mr. Malthus refers emigrations to want of food and room. Emigrations are either of individuals or the multitude; in few cases is want of food and room the motive to emigrate. I do not say that they are inoperative; but that in respect to other causes they are unimportant in the dispersion of mankind. Those who emigrate from Europe to America are not the miserable. Those who cross the Atlantic must possess funds to pay their passage, and supply themselves with necessaries during their voyage. They go abroad, not to escape poverty, but to advance their fortune. Thus the provinces supply London, and the Irish resort to England; or if it should be said, with truth, that some are forced abroad through distress, how many Irish emigrate through ambition, pleasure, fashion, from any cause rather than poverty!

The authenticated emigrations from want are few,

[1] The Scythian, in Justin, says truly, Belli certamina anceps, præmia victoriæ nulla, damna manifesta. lib. 2. c. 3.

these few proceeded in consequence of famines, and not from any continued surcharge of people exceeding the means of subsistence. Of emigrations from political violence and fanatic tyranny, and despotism and conquest, history is crowded with their relations. In the Grecian states, many alternately emigrated from their respective states, as factions or forms of government failed or triumphed[1]. Italy during its republics exhibited the same scenes. The duke of Alva filled Europe with the industrious Netherlanders, and Louis XIV forced abroad his best subjects by the same conduct. When Louis XV seized Corsica, the shores of the Mediterranean were filled with its refugees. The treatment of European governments to their people first planted America, and the same violations of humanity and equity continued and continue to swell the population.

If there are comparatively few instances of emigration in such circumstances, there are still fewer of the movement of great bodies of men simultaneously through want of the means of living. The Hebrews fled (if the account be received) from Egypt, not through want of food, but oppression; they fled from the lamented flesh pots of Egypt to *enjoy* hunger in the Desert. Thus it is said that 240,000[2] Egyptians revolted from Psammeticus to the Ethiopians, not through hunger but ill treatment. So in Greece, Evander[3] conducted a colony of the defeated party from Palantum in Arcadia to Italy. Thus the Syracusans who fled from the tyranny of Dionysius found-

[1] Paruta, p. 141. [2] Herodotus, lib. 2. c. 30.
[3] Dion Halicarnassus, lib. 1. c. 31.

ed Ancona[1]. Thus the people of the colonies founded by Dorieus[2] and by Demaratus of Corinth had abandoned their country in consequence of domestic outrage. Seven hundred Athenian families were forced abroad by Cleomenes; and the thirty tyrants actually expelled the strength of the city, who accumulating without, assailed their enemies and restored both themselves and their country[3]. Thus at Rome, in the time of Appius Claudius[4], a seventh part of the people emigrated, and the retreat of the citizens to mount Aventine was a preparation for a still further secession. In all these and a thousand other instances we hear nothing of the pressure of population against subsistence, except the apologue of the Belly and its members, which Mr. Malthus will hardly pervert to serve his theory. In all these we read of the violence of factions, the tyranny of princes, the monopoly of patrician or of particular families; in short, the rape and ruin of liberty and property the common inheritance of the people.

Mr. Malthus[5] dares not positively say that the northern nations never undertook any expedition unless forced by the want of room and food; he is obliged to admit with Mallet, that annually they held a meeting to consider whom they should assail. Yet amidst all these battles and expeditions by land and water, by the northern and by all barbarians, he insists "a state of sloth and not of restlessness and activity seems evidently to be the *natural* state of man[6]."

[1] Strabo, lib. 5. p. 439.
[2] Herodotus, lib. 5. c. 41.
[3] Herodotus, lib. 5. c. 72.
[4] Dion Halicarnassus, lib. 6. c. 63.
[5] vol. 1. p. 140.
[6] vol. 1. p. 110.

Mobilis et varia est fermè natura malorum.

What is nature or natural, which may be called the caballa of Mr. Malthus, the Stoics reputed the natural the rational state. Mr. Burke says "art is man's nature"—but Mr. Malthus applies it to all those and a hundred other varieties and contradictions. What can he mean in the just quoted passage by the *natural* state? Is it not the simplest state of life and society? Are children slothful, or are they not most imitative and rather vertiginous in their activity? Look to the first societies of men; we do not read of their dispersion in consequence of want of room and food. Thucydides [1] speaks of the perpetual migrations in Hellas. The Huns [2] had no home; and the Scots, whether their name is derived from their erratic disposition as was that of the Pelasgi, were notorious vagabonds, *per diversa vagantes*.

Suppose the savage the natural state, how can this be called a state of sloth and inactivity, where man, to subsist, must rival the swiftest by despatch, the craftiest by artifice, and the strongest by confederate exertions? The pastoral state supposes a roaming life. The shepherd must at least change his abode with his flocks, even though no beasts threatened the fold. Those who combine two modes of living are necessitated to exert a double energy. So much for man being nature's *sloth*. It is astonishing how any one who marked the spirit of adventure—the mighty toil

[1] lib. 1. p. 2.

[2] Nullusque apud eos interrogatus, respondere unde oritur potest, alibi conceptus, natusque procul et longius educatus. Marcellinus, lib. 31. c. 2.

frequently encountered for no profit, could so characterize mankind. Mr. Malthus has probably been deceived into this remark by accounts of savages—that having hunted down a beast, they sleep and eat till the brute has been consumed; hungry and jaded they sink under fatigue and repletion. Yet at another time these same men would exhibit a state of pure vitality. The savage knows but two situations, and they are the extremes of hunger and gluttony—of a frame wrenched by exertion, and again dissolved by intolerable lassitude.

It might have been supposed that Mr. Malthus would have had some misgiving of his philosophy, when he adverted to total emigrations. When Orgetorix, one of the heroic tribe, wished to conquer Gaul, he thought it convenient to persuade the Helvetians that their country was confined for their numbers. Orgetorix died, but his successors in power pursued the same policy. The people believed as they were taught; they destroyed their towns, villages, and private buildings, and all the corn which they were unable to carry with them, determined to conquer or perish [1]. Here I cannot perceive the imputed pressure of population against subsistence, or the people's want of room and food. They assailed Gaul as Cæsar had, and as the same general had advanced into Britain. Cæsar, who seems to have been jealous that the Helvetians should interfere with the theatre of his glory, met and repelled them; and those people who could not live at home with their whole stores, contrived to sub-

[1] He says they did so, ut domum reditionis spe sublata, paratiores ad omnia pericula subeunda essent.

sist on their diminished means within their former frontier. But these are not the entire consequences deducible from this fact—their wants were not so very pressing, when they destroyed their superfluous grain preparatory to the expedition. Observe also, the emigration was total. And Mr. Malthus is obliged to admit that entire emigrations were not uncommon. What is his answer? That these evinced "the unwillingness of the society to divide, but by no means that they were straitened for room." Wonderful love! We are then to conclude, that in a world in which, according to Mr. Malthus, all are stinted for room and food, whole nations, which could not subsist at home, passed in a mass abroad through a refined sensibility—nay, though their own country could not support them singly, another country, though straitened, did support them and its former population. Does this prove a pressure of people against food in the country supporting so increased a population? Nor is this half the wonder of this prodigious pressure. Mr. Malthus admits, "that after a great emigration the countries often remained quite deserted and unoccupied for a long time[1]." How could this happen if the pressure of population was general? Would not the vacuum be instantly replenished? Would not the land be instantly overrun and possessed, as on the emigration of the Ionians the Achæans divided their land and cities by lots among themselves[2]? Many countries have been deserted, and have remained so; Mallet[3] speaks of 20,000 men who accompanied the

[1] vol. 1. p. 137.

[2] Pausanias, lib. 7. c. 6.

[3] History of Denmark, vol. 1. p. 137.

Lombards into Italy, whose emigration so depopulated the country, that the king of France sent Swabians to occupy it; and Sybaris[1], being conquered, remained, according to Strabo, 58 years unoccupied.

I find nothing, generally, in modern or ancient authors, to justify the conclusions of Mr. Malthus respecting the causes of war and emigration. I do not say that misery has had no influence. I intimate that the want of food and room has been the least urgent of all their inducements. The Gauls envied the Romans their cultivated lands, and they won the Capitol. But though the Romans lived better than the Gauls, are we to conclude the Gauls were pinched with poverty at home? If so, all unsatisfied desires are physical wants. Florus[2] attributes the assaults of the Cimbri, Theutoni, and Tigurini on the Roman empire to the overflow of the ocean pushing them from their seats: and just as truly as Malthus attributes to the flood of life, and the ebb of subsistence, the movements and removals of mankind. Rome had carried her power beyond her moral means:

——Then the spirits of the north swept
Rome from the earth where in her pomp she slept.

She had advanced on all sides, and was in her turn repelled, and again circumscribed within her seven hills, long before the Arimaspians[3] drove out the Issedones: these forced forward the Scythians, the Scythians expelled the Cimmerians; these in the course of time overspread Asia[4], occupied Lydia, seized Sar-

[1] Strabo, lib. 6. p. 263. [2] lib. 3. c. 3.
[3] Herodotus, lib. 4. c. 13. [4] Herodotus, lib. 1. c. 15.

dis. The Cimmerians again reflowed. If these advances and retreats were effected by want of food, we must call impulse a consuming power, and hunger shall become a generic term for every passion, every folly, and all the extravagances of the human heart. Mr. Malthus, unobserving the damning documents of all history, which confirm that wars and emigrations have been the effects of restlessness, tyranny, and ambition, in the utmost confusion of ideas and figures, says, "These combined causes soon produce (in the pastoral state) their *natural* and invariable effect—an extended population. A more frequent and rapid change of place then becomes necessary; a wider and more extensive territory is successively occupied; a broader desolation extends all around them; want pinches the less fortunate members of society; and at length the impossibility of supporting such a number together becomes too evident to be resisted. Young *scions* are then pushed out from the parent stock, and instructed to explore fresh regions, and to gain happier seats for themselves by their *swords*. The world is all before them, 'where to choose[1].'" Really, Mr. Malthus, this is against all the prerogatives of bad writing. A country, he insists, as it becomes occupied with herds and shepherds, suffers aggravated desolation; and the less fortunate members of this pastoral society reverse the happy prospect proposed by Isaiah, for it seems they, that is, the young scions, beat their crooks into rapiers! Why? against whom? for Mr. Malthus says "the world is all before them, where to choose." Then these valo-

[1] vol. 1. p. 113.

rous young scions must, like the immortal Getæ, war on the welkin. After this Mr. Malthus should have dwelt on the emigration from the East to Shinar, and the subsequent dispersion from Babel; and though these could not have helped his argument, for in neither case is any hint given of population pressing against the means of subsistence, part of the account would have countenanced his rhetoric, while his language affords some proof of this ancient story; as it appears that even in our days the sin of attempting to build *castles in the air* will be visited on the projectors by broken metaphors, and every confusion of language and discourse.

If this passage does not exhibit of itself the extreme incompetence of Mr. Malthus to lead the public opinion, I quote the following from the same chapter, entitled *Of the checks to population amongst the ancient inhabitants of the north of Europe*: "We are told that Abram and Lot had so great substance in cattle that the land would not bear them both, that they might dwell together. There was strife between their herdsmen; and Abram proposed to Lot to separate, and said, Is not the whole land before thee? If thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left. This simple observation and proposal is [are] a striking illustration of that great spring of action which overspread the whole earth with people; and in the progress of time drove some of the less fortunate inhabitants of the globe, yielding to irresistible pressure, to seek a scanty subsistence in the burning deserts of Asia and Africa, and the frozen regions of

Siberia and North America." From the proposal of Abram to Lot Mr. Malthus draws an argument for the general pressure of population against food, though, confessedly, the pressure was of abundance, *so great substance of cattle*; their inconvenience was superfluity, and they could relieve this by turning to the right or to the left. It is almost discreditable to lose time in exposing such contradictions.

In his chapter on *Emigration* we are assailed with various absurdities:—indeed they are not few, nor casual, nor shadowy; but general and decided. He says, "Every resource however from emigration, if used effectually, as this would be, must be of short duration. There is scarcely a state in Europe, *except perhaps Russia*, the inhabitants of which do not often endeavour to better their condition by removing to other countries. As these states, *therefore*, have nearly all rather a redundant than deficient population[1]," &c. Yet these Russians, the favoured among the nations of Europe, are not permitted to emigrate. Mr. Malthus has been at St. Petersburg. Does he imagine that the Russians are better fed than the British? Why, the people of Britain would consider Russian fare little better than famine; and by the by they are forced occasionally to eat the rind of the pine[2]. But his absurdity is monstrous when he accounts for the redundancy of European population, "*except perhaps in Russia*," that the inhabitants of the different states of Europe *endeavour to better their condition by removing to other countries*. This is rare induction, particularly by Mr. Malthus, who

[1] vol. 2. p. 69. [2] Tooke's History of Russia, vol. 1, p. 615.

says, "It is the hope of bettering our condition, and the fear of want, rather than want itself, that is the best stimulus to industry." And to the same purport, "The desire of bettering our condition, and the fear of making it worse, like the *vis mediatrix naturæ* in physic, is the *vis mediatrix reipublicæ* in politics[1]:" and thus we reach a conclusion, that a redundant population and a desire to better our condition are synonymous. The redundancy of population is not confined to Europe: he hints that it operates in America, and in all states and nations; the savage, the pastoral, the agricultural, and all orders and gradations of social life. This being his text and commentary, let him reconcile the following dogmas with his general reasoning. The savage state, without forecast or retrospect[2], is so beneath all our views and prospects, that I abandon it to his dominion. Respecting the others, I feel myself intimately interested. I ask him, how does his ten-times repeated assertion, that population presses against the means of subsistence, coincide with the following positions? "It is the *nature* of pasturage to produce food for a much greater number of people than it can employ[3]." Population, then, does not press in this state of society on subsistence. Again, he says, "It is the *nature* of agriculture,

[1] vol. 2. p. 106.

[2] Savages want food from improvidence. Lichtenstein says, "The Caffres, who have no idea but of living from day to day, without any regard to the future, consider the breeding of cattle kept by the colonists as wholly superfluous." Park also speaks of the procrastinating temper of the Negroes: present pleasure is their only object; futurity gives them little or no concern. p. 321.

[3] vol. 1. p. 415.

particularly when well conducted, to produce support for a considerable number above that which it employs[1]." Neither, then, does population press on subsistence in this state of society. I have already quoted what he says of *arts and manufactures, that without these modern Europe would be unpeopled*[2]. Those, then, who follow arts and manufactures must of course be deducted from his pressure on subsistence. One state only remains to be considered, the commercial, of which he says, "if things had been left to take their *natural* course, there is no reason to think that the commercial part of the society would have increased beyond the surplus produce of the cultivators; but the high profits of commerce, from monopolies and other peculiar encouragements, have altered this *natural* course of things, and the body politic is in an artificial and, in some degree, diseased state, with one of its principal members out of proportion to the rest[3]." Here then we have three *natures* expressly stated; by which three conditions of society, two of which, he says, by their *nature* would produce more food than those who exercise them could consume, and a third, which would not have consumed more, *naturally*, than the surplus of the cultivators: these, with artists and manufacturers just mentioned, embrace all the great component parts of civilized and social life. How, then, does he reconcile the grand dogma of population pressing against the means of subsistence, and these statements? for there is no dogma in any writer more enforced, more variously and unremittingly pursued, than the pressure

[1] vol. 2. p. 203. [2] vol. 2. p. 273. [3] vol. 2. p. 159.

of population against subsistence, arising from an inordinate propensity or tendency of man to multiply[1]. To such extent are these opinions inculcated, that we might imagine we were reading Adrian Beverland, who held that original sin was Adam's connexion with his wife; or Paracelsus, who, among his fancies in chemistry, propounded that sin and the propagation of mankind were necessary associates.

Yet Mr. Malthus, who fatigues, yet is never weary of contradictions and repugnancies, insists that he is not unfriendly to population; and requires the reader to attend to the *bent and spirit*[2] of his book. Why should an author, and in the fourth edition of his work, appeal from his language, to the reader's gross guess at his meaning, to the bent and spirit of his theory? What critical alembic shall make the extract, and what new mechanism shall preserve the essence? For myself, most conscientiously I declare, that the straight and crooked parts of this essay, all that is right-forward and involved in his doctrine, both in substance and spirit, are averse to populousness. I remember he says, probably to divert animadversion, "That an increase of population, when it follows its *natural* order, is both a great positive good in itself, and absolutely necessary to a further increase in the animal produce of the land and labour of any country, I should be the last to deny. The only question is, what is the *natural* order of its progress[3]?" This order is, he insists, contrary to Sir James Stewart, when agriculture precedes multiplication; that is, when food exceeds population.

[1] vol. 2. p. 239. [2] vol. 2. p. 441. [3] vol. 2. p. 213.

Even on this reconsidered statement, I repeat, he is unfavourable to population; for he repeatedly affirms that there is a redundancy of people in all European states, "except perhaps in Russia." He also frequently mentions that population is kept up to the level of the means of subsistence. And a fundamental maxim of his science is: "the constant effort towards population, which is found to act even in the most vicious societies, increases the number of people before the means of subsistence[1]." Then what becomes of his verbal patronage for population when it *follows its natural order*, which never occurs, the surplus being always on the side of population?

Yet Mr. Malthus, in order to crown the whole series of contradictions, says, "he can *easily* conceive that this country, with a proper direction of the national industry, might, in the course of some centuries, contain two or three times its present population, and yet every man in the kingdom be much better fed and clothed than he is at present[2]." Who would not think that this was a passage purloined from Mr. Godwin and the Perfectibles? Few extravagances in authors have more surprised me than this flourish. Swift said of an imaginary people;—they are buried on their head, for they hold all things will be turned upside down. I leave the application to the reader.

Mr. Malthus may appeal to the *bent and spirit* of his work, having uttered a saving insulated extravagance amidst a throng of contrary assertions; he may for the instant make votive offerings to Pan, and expect that after centuries dead men on their crowns

[1] vol. 1. p. 22. [2] vol. 2. p. 274.

will be live men afoot: he may use *nature* and *natural*, which perform more offices than the good and evil principles in the Persian theology, with all the subinfeudation of their agents and satellites; he may talk of the *natural* order, and that he favours multiplication. Yet his manifest opinions, his direct language, his selections from historians and travellers, his reasoning, his sophistication, his surmises; the propensities he attributes to man, the order he confers on his great agent *nature*, declare the contrary. One would suppose, from his account of wars and cannibalism, that mankind were all descendants of Thyestes. Man in his philosophy is an eating creature, rife to generate, who increases and hungers and ravens and famishes; even a plentiful season is ominous, and successive years of prosperity, a demonstration that famine and dearth advance. His words are[1], "Among the signs of an approaching dearth, Dr. Short mentions one or more years of luxuriant crops together; and this observation is probably just, as we know that the general effect of years of cheapness and abundance, is to dispose a greater number of persons to marry, and under such circumstances the return of a year merely of an average crop might produce a scarcity." Dr. Short's guess means, in vulgar language, "long fair, long foul." Suppose an average year after a plentiful year; suppose many marriages, still nine months must succeed before the hypothetical plenty added one individual to the original stock. What would be the amount of the consumption of all the babes for the first and second years? Could their sucking one year, or eating

[1] vol. 1. p. 567.

panada the second, or a slice from a quartern loaf the third, produce a scarcity? And, I ask, was the surplus of the abundant years all wasted at the marriage-feasts and at the christenings? Dr. Short talks of more years than one of luxuriant crops. What, have Pharaoh and his alien minister again been busy to convert abundance and want to the subjugation of the people?

Mr. Malthus far surpasses Dr. Short in his commentary on the Doctor's *signs of an approaching dearth*. He says[1], "that contemplating the *plagues and sickly seasons* which occur in these tables (of Sussmilch), after a period of rapid increase, it is impossible not to be impressed with an idea that the number of inhabitants had in these instances exceeded the food, and the accommodations necessary to preserve health." Here *accommodations* appear in aid of food, and truly an aggregate ally of large pretensions. No matter. It is enough that Mr. Malthus proves his theory[2] of the unabated disposition to increase in man, by imputing the plagues and sickly seasons to "increase and multiply." When Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit,

Th' inclement seasons, rain, ice, hail, and snow,

changed the face of heaven. But now, when original sin has become inveterate iniquity, the badness of the seasons is aggravated; what was inclement then, is now superlatively sickly; and thus plagues, pestilences and famines, Mr. Malthus states and restates, are

[1] vol. 1. p. 553.

[2] I know nothing superior to this, except the British ministers' referring the destruction of Bonaparte's army by the frost, to their ability. Yet Bonaparte had rather a better set-off in his favour in the expedition to Walcheren.

the terrible correctives of the redundance of mankind[1].

This is not a casual conjecture; for Mr. Malthus, with little power to act the dogmatist, insists it is *impossible* not to be impressed with an idea that sickly seasons arise from a rapid population. If so, and these are induced by overbreeding, ultra-population rules the highest destiny. According to this arrangement, astrology, instead of sovereign on earth, is subject in heaven. Admirable discovery! Now we have only to ascertain the excess beyond the average deaths under different heads of disease, with the casual increase of the people, and prepare for a catarrh, or the natural small-pox, or the typhus fever from Ireland, or for the plague coming post haste in a bill of parcels from Smyrna.

Mr. Malthus has made another advance toward this anticipated knowledge. Sickly seasons, and of course excess of people, he says are periodical. "It appears[2] clearly from the very valuable tables of mortality which Sussmilch has collected, and which include periods of fifty or sixty years, that all the countries of Europe are subject to periodical sickly seasons, and very few are exempt from those great and wasting plagues which once or twice perhaps in a century sweep off the third or fourth part of the inhabitants[3]."

[1] vol. 1. p. 564, 565.

[2] vol. 1. p. 537.

[3] Of the 254 great famines and dearths enumerated in the table, 15 were before the Christian æra, beginning with that which occurred in Palestine in the time of Abraham. If, subtracting these 15, we divide the years of the present æra by the remainder, it will appear that the average interval between the visits of this dreadful scourge has been only about $7\frac{1}{2}$ years. vol. 1. p. 564.

Here then their recurrence, and of course overbreeding, appear comet-like twice a century: in a more extended period, he says they follow at intervals of seven and eight years. Yet unfortunately for this strong alliance and necessary connexion between increasing populousness and seasonable mortalities, Mr. Malthus states, "Epidemics have their seldomer or frequenter returns, according to their sundry soils, situations, air, &c. Hence some have their yearly, as Egypt and Constantinople; others, once in four or five years, as about Tripoli and Aleppo; others, scarce once in ten, twelve, or thirteen years, as England; others not in less than twenty years, as Norway and the northern islands [1]."

There is no end to the absurdities and contradictions of Mr. Malthus. Nor are his fantastic views harmless, or amusing, or grateful. No: they have nothing cheering; on the contrary, want, and pressure, and distress, and sickness, and disease, from *deep-rooted causes, from the laws of nature*, from an increase of people, from an increase of food, no matter whether we contemplate earth or heaven, laws or their infraction, all form one labyrinth leading to one sad extremity.—And if you hearken to Mr. Malthus, all this is irremediable: for he says [2], "in a country which keeps its population at a certain standard—if the average number of marriages and births be given, it is evident that the average number of deaths will also be given: and to use Dr. Heberden's metaphor, the channels through which the great stream of mortality is constantly flowing, will always convey off a given quantity. Now if we stop up any of these channels, it is most perfectly

[1] vol. 1. p. 139, note. [2] vol. 2. p. 286.

clear, that the stream of mortality must run with greater force through some of the other channels; that is, if we eradicate some diseases, others will become proportionably more fatal." We have then the satisfaction to hear that a country may not be able to prolong the life of those whom it has rescued from disease and death; that if we cure the gouty, we kill the paralytic; and that if we redeem the infant from the grave by the vaccinating lancet, we place a sword in the soldier's hand, or sharpen the axe of the executioner!

Mr. Malthus may insist on his love of the poor, and his love of population: I have heard he is a good man; yet is he an indifferent author. Having read one extreme in Godwin, he threw himself into the opposite extravagance: and having obtained a reputation, he cannot abandon the cause of his glory. Like other heroes, his honour requires him to defend his acquisitions. I do not doubt but he is a good man: would he were a poet! and then we might repeat that he is the best *natured* man with the worst *natured* muse. He says, among a hundred similar expressions, "corn countries are more populous than pasture countries, and rice countries more populous than corn countries. But their happiness does not depend either upon their being thinly or fully inhabited; upon their poverty or their riches, their youth or their age, but on the proportion which the population and the food bear to each other[1]." Really, then, the island Rodriguez[2], eighteen miles long and six broad, abounding in wood, water, land turtles, &c. and containing only three families, is more happy than Great Britain or all Eu-

[1] vol. 1. p. 577. [2] Grant's History of the Mauritius, p. 103.

rope together[1]; where the people, according to Mr. Malthus, are disproportioned to their food. And Rodriguez is three or thirty times less happy, if each family contained ten persons, than Juan Fernandez. Alexander Selkirk lived on it alone; for Friday was a fancied obtruder by De Foe, who so far was ignorant of this new and only felicity of mankind. Selkirk lived on this island for four years at nature's mighty feast, and none to interrupt his board or lessen his store, the happiest man on record, except perhaps Philoctetes. Admirable philosopher! The power of satiating the coarsest animal appetite

"Is all in all, and I in thee,
For ever: and in me all whom thou lov'st."

Were he to write a commentary on the Iliad, he would praise the genius of the poet who imagined the *perpetual chime:* and if he recounted the defeat of Hector, it would begin and end with the mal-administration of the commissariat. Mr. Malthus's man is all mouth. Yet he who might assume the motto,

"Man delights not me, nor woman neither,"

assures us he favours population when it follows the *natural* order.

If Mr. Malthus affixed any meaning to the last quotation, and that the proportion which food bears to the population is first and last and midst, the criterion of happiness, and happiness alone—how happy is Otaheite amidst its Eareeoie societies, and infanticides, and wars! for Mr. Malthus admits[2] that *its population is considerably below the average means of*

[1] vol. 2. p. 273.

[2] vol. 1. p. 97.

subsistence. How blessed is Russia, which, as I have before quoted from him, is the only country that perhaps has not a redundant population! How paradisaical must be Siberia; and particularly that part of it in the neighbourhood of Krasnoyarsh; for Pallas says, a pood or forty pounds of wheaten flour was sold for about twopence halfpenny, an ox for five shillings, and a cow for about four!—Yet what is Mr. Malthus's remark on this account? Does he rejoice? No: he calls this an *unnatural cheapness*[1]; and refers it to a want of vent for the products of the soil:—this, says he, will soon arise: indeed he *concludes* it must have already happened; and that population now proceeds with rapid strides. I cannot understand what he means by unnatural cheapness on this occasion, nor on any other, except that the article sold did not pay the cost of production. But how little must have been that expense in a country of vast extent, thinly peopled, inland, and so circumstanced that Pallas[2] speaks in admiration of the facility of its cultivation and the abundance of its returns!

There is another circumstance which Mr. Malthus seldom mentions, and then so tenderly and generally, which, with the silence of his opponents on his reserve, is a sad sign of the spirit of the times. He talks of no vent, but nothing of misrule—of unnatural cheapness, but nothing of despotism. Is this the mode for freemen and citizens to treat the principle of population, or any other principle? Yet has this baseness (in honesty and truth I cannot lessen the term) excited little resentment. Mr. Malthus, when he escapes

[1] vol. 1. p. 206. [2] Travels, t. 1. p. 261.

from *nature* and *its great purposes*, condemns the people and reviles *the indolent* [1] *inhabitants of the plains of Siberia*—reviles them while he praises their government. "And though the Russian government has been incessant in its endeavours to convert the pastoral tribes of Siberia to agriculture, yet many obstinately persist in bidding defiance to any attempts that can be made to wean them from their injurious sloth [2]." Why should they labour? does he not say there is no sufficient vent for the produce of their labour? If there were a vent, would increased labour improve the labourer's condition? Mr. Malthus assures us the people are slothful and indolent; and that the Russian government is incessant in its endeavours to promote agriculture. What have been its attempts to wean the people from their sloth? Has it made them free? A Tartar's curse is, May you live in one place, and work like a Russian [3]!

Wonderful have been the exertions of this government, for mighty are the pretensions of its rulers. Catharine was prodigiously solicitous even for the Poles, when amidst the massacres of the people, and the devastations of the country, she called herself their *tender mother*, (*mater Eumenidum*): and who can doubt her humility and patriotism, when in her *Instructions* [4], &c., she says, "We think and esteem it our glory to declare that we are created for our people." And an

[1] vol. 1. p. 200.

[2] vol. 1. p. 207.

[3] Bell's Travels. Pinkerton, vol. 7. p. 281. Lesseps says, "that the vicinity of the Russian settlements has hitherto produced no change in the mode of life of the resident Cossacs." Travels, vol. 2. p. 87. Why should it?

[4] p. 194.

English writer informs us that the Russians are the happiest people on earth, "because the peasantry look upon the monarch as a divinity; styling him god of the earth—*Zemnoi Bog:* ignorant of any government but a despotic sceptre, and of any condition but vassalage; happily deprived of all means of evil information." These are not the words of Mr. Malthus[1]; he praises the government and condemns the people; and refers their indolence to any cause but the true one; to no cause—to *unnatural cheapness*.—The same unnatural cheapness is observable in South America[2], where an ox is not worth one shilling, or one penny; and there the people have had their Zemnoi Bog; and there to kneel on a carpet was a prerogative of the white people. At present they begin to disbelieve that Ferdinand is a divinity on earth; that he can do no

[1] They are the words of Mr. Eton. Mr. Thornton quotes and condemns them: yet Mr. Thornton speaks of a rival government —the Porte, thus: "Only the koran and books treating of the law and the doctrines of the Prophet were forbidden to be printed; a useful and salutary prohibition, which at the same time preserves religion in its purity," &c. vol. 1. p. 65. The religion that such conduct induces is much like that of the Russians, who enjoy religion in its purity. Thornton says, a Russian would suffer martyrdom sooner than smoke tobacco, because the Scripture says, That which enters into the mouth does not defile a man, but that which comes out of his mouth. vol. 2. p. 94.

[2] Semple's Sketches of the Carraccas. Mawe speaking of Barriza Negro, near Monte Video, says, "here are numbers of great breeding estates, many of which are stocked with from 60,000 to 200,000 head of cattle; those are guarded principally by men of Paraguay, called peons. 10,000 head are allotted to four or five peons, whose business is to collect them every morning and evening."

wrong; and that ministers are always right: in short, they begin to think that freedom is better than slavery. Nor is it improbable that, should they conquer their liberty, this will be as efficient in promoting agriculture and population, as the egotism of an empress, or the impotent ukases of her successors.

He who seeks for the causes of the people's sloth, and their paucity, and the wilderness which surrounds them, except in their government when it is despotic, is a contemptible theorist. Ehrenmalm, pursuing a scale of superlative misery, considered the life of the Laplander more easy than that of the Greenlander; and the Greenlander's life, which admits no choice but the ice of the sea or the ice of the land, as "better than the life of the people of Siberia, who only see the arrival of soldiers or disgraced courtiers[1]." What signify the wishes or the exertions of a despotic prince? And it has been long remarked[2], that a reward offered in a Russian proclamation is always clogged by a threat:—they avail not. Suppose them as rational as they are absurd: what did Catharine's village-building scheme produce in Russia? The money was absorbed by the courtiers; and Zemnoi Bog, the tender mother, was entertained on her tour with visions of distant towns and a population multiplied to the eye of her godship—just as a company of strollers represent a drama in a barn, "one man playing many parts." What signify the good laws of a despot? Catharine states unconsciously[3], that the cause of the non-execution of the ordinance of 1722, which en-

[1] Pinkerton, Travels, vol. 1. p. 370.
[2] Annual Register, 1770, p. 30.
[3] Instructions, p. 135.

joined that persons who tortured their vassals should be submitted to guardians, is *unknown*. The imperial ordinance was waste paper; and the counterparts of Huggins and Hodges flogged their vassals to death in contempt of the mandate. Not only the laws but the individual orders of the despot are contemned. Colonel Thespy de Belcourt, a Polish officer, was sent with others to Siberia. They were ill treated on the road, contrary to the express injunctions of the Empress. The colonel relates in his memoirs, that when he signified to his conductors the command of the Empress, they answered, *Le bon Dieu est bien haut, et l'Impératrice est bien loin; nous ferons ce qu'il nous plaira.*

What! could not Russia, or even Siberia, win from Mr. Malthus one innuendo respecting the effects of despotism aggravated unnaturally by distance from the point of its concentration? No: the sum and substance of his sagacity discovered that the people were incorrigibly slothful; and that population was restrained by the unnatural cheapness of cattle and grain. Catharine[1] draws a better conclusion. Speaking of the Russians, she says "that not one fourth of the children of one marriage attains maturity: and she assigns as the cause of this premature mortality, that the lords never reside in the villages—and that they tax the people by the poll from one to five rubles, [she might have added, to five hundred] without regarding their ability to pay them. This, she adds, "often obliges husbandmen to quit their homes sometimes for fifteen years, in order to acquire means to satisfy their lords." Mr. Malthus

[1] Instructions, p. 138.

will call this a pressure of population against the means of subsistence; and I doubt if he would be restrained, though he were reminded that more than once he has distinguished Russia from those nations of Europe which suffer a redundant population. I say that these children die through despotism, through a subinfeudation of tyranny. Who can believe that there is a stint of subsistence in Siberia? Yet the abbé Chappe d'Auteroche[1] affirmed that two-thirds of the children of Siberia die in infancy, though, he subjoins, their parents are robust. He also speaks of the depopulation of villages. The same is observed respecting the people of the Cape of Good Hope. Lord Valentia says, the Dutch debilitated the Hottentots by supplying them with spirits to excess, and thus they enslaved them. So far both governments pursued the same objects, but by different means;—the consequences are similar. Lichtenstein, speaking of the colonists at the Cape, who abound with provisions, observes, "it is very moderate to reckon ten children to each family[2]." The mortality, however, is extreme. Salt says of this country, "nothing seems wanting except an increase of population, which an extraordinary fatality among children seems to render hopeless without some external assistance; but every attempt of this nature has not been attended hitherto with the expected advantages[3]." Humboldt also speaks of the mortality of infants in parts of South America. What is the cause of this? The pressure of population? No; but the pressure of bad government, of intolerable masters, just as overworked

[1] Annual Register, 1764, p. 93. [2] p. 113. [3] Travels, p. 9.

negresses in the West Indies miscarry:—it is the abuse of human life and human comforts.

Mr. Malthus, having mentioned a mortality, cries, Here is a proof of the great tendency, the universal pressure;—*nature* is at work to check redundances. Then they who torture, they who divorce the husband and wife, and thus expose whole families to premature death, that they may raise a few rubles on the husband's head, are accredited agents in the prime ministry of all-reconciling nature; and the chief of this huge despotism, who meditated, even in his escape from ruin and desolation, new wars and a new crusade, is nature's self. The people are dispersed, or they are destroyed in the armies, and their families are reduced. "Aye," says Mr. Malthus, "we always find nature faithful to her great object; at every false step we commit, ready to admonish us of our errors[1]:" that is, the people overbreed. Neither here nor any where that Russian affairs are discussed, does the despotism of chiefs and nobles interrupt the tenour of his theme. If the children perish excessively, reference is made to an unnatural overbreeding people[2]; much in the style of Colonel Keating, who, "in his

[1] vol. 2. p. 287. In the next page promiscuous intercourse appears "admonishing us severely of our error; would point to the only line of conduct approved by nature, reason, and religion; abstinence from marriage till we can support our children; a chastity till that period arrives."

[2] So far as Mr. Malthus may be exculpated by a single incidental passage *contradicting* a hundred others, I quote the following: "Sir Francis d'Ivernois very justly observes, that if the various states of Europe kept and published annually an exact account of their population, noting carefully, in a second column, the exact

balances and harmonies of nature," says; "though the lioness have three whelps, two always die." Mr. Malthus might as well attribute the mortality of the Russians in the field and at their sieges, and when they stormed Ishmael or Oczakow, to the pressure of population against food, as the great mortality of infant children to their overbreeding parents. A bad government will destroy the children; a worse will destroy the men; and the worst will mortify even the passion of the sexes, and obliterate the human race.

This may be thought a dread heresy by Mr. Malthus and the votaries of the new system,—those who hold that if men be fed they will breed, and that government has little influence in restricting the population of mankind.

Yet does tyranny consume and extinguish the people; nay, hereditary honours have frequently worn away the prerogative classes. The bourgeoisie of the town of Berne, that is, the aristocracy of the canton of Berne, for the government of the canton is possessed by the municipality[1], declined; and in order to recruit its numbers from 1583 to 1654, 487 families were made

age at which the children die, this second column would show the relative merit of the governments, and the comparative happiness of their subjects." vol. 1. p. 471. Yet so little influence had government on population, in his conviction, that eight lines preceding this quotation he couples America and Russia, the freest and most despotic governments. His words are: "In countries circumstanced like America or Russia, or in other countries after a great mortality, a large proportion of births may be a favourable symptom."

[1] In all the aristocratical cantons, those who are not born in the city are subjects. Bibliothèque de l'Homme Publique, vol. 5. partie 2. p. 30.

bourgeois. In two centuries 379 of these became extinct; and in 1783 little more than one-fifth of those were in existence. In a century, from 1684 to 1784, 207 Bernoise families became extinct. Le Statistique de la Suisse specifies other incorporations of families, and their repeated extinction; yet to be eligible to the highest offices[1] marriage is requisite. Mr. Malthus[2] has noticed the failure of the Bernoise families; and the whole account is stated by him with seeming gratification, as a proof of the discreet reserve of the people, and the benefit which must result in consequence to society. Truly, the annihilation of an order of people, with their repeated recruits, happily illustrates the excellence of the preventive check. But Mr. Malthus forgets that all this sadly interferes with another cardinal position of his *craft*, that population will always keep itself up to the level of the means of subsistence. Must we suppose that all those who were chosen for their character and circumstances, and who from their situation were among the favoured, perished through distress?

This event is no peculiarity. The same occurred at Rome among the patricians, and afterward among the Venetian nobles. Shakespear hit their character when Petruchio says that he went to Padua "to wive wealthily, and therefore happily." For it was not their vice to marry before they could provide for a family. Such was the prudence of the nobility, so cautious were they that population should not press on the means of subsistence, that a law[3] was passed

[1] That is, senators, &c. Bibliothèque de l'Homme, tome 5. p. 56.

[2] vol. 1. p. 411.

[3] De Statutis Venetis, p. 185.

in 1535, prohibiting any Venetian from giving more than 5000 ducats as a portion with his daughter; and in 1550 the sum was reduced to 4000 ducats. What was the result of this mighty circumspection? The citizens who became the noble in respect to the new citizens gradually declined. Bodin[1] speaks of their being reduced to 4 or 5000. Amelot says they had fallen to 2500; and when Addison wrote they were only 1500, "notwithstanding the addition of many new families since that time. It is very strange that with this advantage they are not able to keep up their numbers, considering that the nobility spreads equally through all the brothers, and that so very few of them are destroyed by the wars of the republic[2]." Here those who possessed the good things of the state could not support their order, though repeatedly recruited from the people;—with all their wealth and honours, and privileges and prerogatives, they perished.

"———'Tis the plague of great ones,
Prerogatived are they less than the base:
'Tis destiny unshunnable: 'Tis death."

The prerogative order dissolved, though the most wretched of mankind; the Roman Catholics of Ireland, the Pariars of Hindostan, the Jews every where, support their race; yet the patricians of Rome, the burghers of Berne, the noble Venetians, perish among honours and opulence. So in England, even in the present reign, 48 titles conferred by former kings have become extinct; and not a few peerages have also ceased even during the life of him who conferred

[1] De la République, liv. 2. p. 225.

[2] Remarks on Italy, Works, vol. 5. p. 186.

them. Therefore Josephus[1] and after him Eusebius[2] are greatly mistaken in considering the extinction of Herod's race within a century miraculous. It is not uncommon; it is customary to all those who would respire on commanding heights, contemning the people and the plains. The *effeminate disease* mentioned by Hippocrates[3] was confined to the higher orders. The inability to continue the race is confined to the noble Scythians. The nobleman can scarcely be a father, the lady cannot be a nurse should she be a mother[4]. The child even by sucking the strength of a woman is hardly reared. How shall this thing, which barely lives, communicate life? Generation by such parents is like a spring in the desert;—it has no stream. Nobles are exotics in a conservatory adorned with a double flower; while the people are the wild plants of the field, which quicken in every joint and root and berry, and though cropped, and trodden, live and luxuriate.

[1] Antiq. lib. 18. c. 11. [2] Præparat. Evang. lib. 2. c. 10.

[3] Περι αερων.

[4] Interea tormentum ingens nubentibus hæret
Quod nequeunt parere, &c. Juvenal. Sat. 2. v. 136.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

Means adopted to increase the people—promiscuous intercourse—polygamy—fining bachelors—compulsory measures—parish marriages. Mr. Malthus—bounties—exemptions—lying-in and foundling hospitals. Mr. Malthus. Hospitals for health. England deficient in some respects—greatly improved in others. Mr. Malthus supposes that inoculation has not increased population, and that all remedies against plagues, &c. have also been ineffectual.—On the contrary, health promotes population; and every life saved is so much stock saved—the people riches.

THOSE who have favoured the multiplication of mankind have suggested different modes to promote this object. Some have proposed a promiscuous intercourse between the sexes. According to Strabo[1], the Spartans having made a vow that they would not cohabit with their wives during the siege of Messene, which unexpectedly lasted nineteen years, and fearing that their country might be depopulated, directed the young of both sexes, who were children at the commencement of this war, to live promiscuously, *ut cuncti virginibus cunctis commiscerentur, rati hoc pacto copiosiorem procreatum in subolem.* To a similar state of society Sir John Davies attributes the population of Ireland: "living by the milk of the cow, without husbandry or tillage; there they in-

[1] lib. 6. p. 510.

creased and multiplied into infinite numbers by promiscuous generation among themselves[1]."

On the contrary, some writers consider promiscuous cohabitation injurious to population; but they employ this expression defectively. Mr. Mallet, in the reign of Charles the Second, introduced a bill to repeal one which had been passed in that of James, which enacted that it was felony to marry a second husband or wife, the former being living." He pressed the repeal as a measure "for peopling the nation, and preventing the promiscuous use of women[2]." Mr. Malthus also considers a promiscuous connexion a great check; but in no instance does he employ the expression accurately, though he uses it, as is usual with him, in a variety of senses. The Eareeoie societies approach this unlimited profligacy, I admit; but he employs the term prostitution and promiscuous intercourse[3] respecting these societies generally, and in his language these expressions are synonymous. But they are not interchangeable. Graunt, in his Bills of mortality, applies it with more propriety. He says, "when it is found how many ewes, suppose twenty, one ram will serve, we may geld nineteen or thereabouts; for if you emasculate but ten, you shall by promiscuous copulation hinder the increase." This question I submit to the curious in sheep.

After promiscuous intercourse we ascend to concubinage and polygamy. Sir James Stewart seems to

[1] On Ireland, p. 162. [2] Annual Register, 1763, p. 265.

[3] The following numbers will lead to some passages exhibiting his loose phraseology in this particular: vol. 1. p. 18, 88, 90, 93, 96, 99, 101, 102, 184, 186, &c.

have acquiesced in the ability of such connexions to increase the people: he says, "I have not proposed plans of multiplication, &c., principally because I believe it will be found a sufficient abundance of children are born already, and that we have neither occasion for concubinage nor polygamy to increase their numbers[1]."

Those who favour concubinage resort necessarily to patriarchal times. According to Selden[2], before the law, marriage conferred no distinction in the intercourse of the sexes. Mahomet followed the early habits of the Jews, which suited the rude people he commanded, and his own temperament. There is a curious sort of concubinage in Russia: "in many families the father marries his son, while a boy of eight or nine years old, to a girl of a more advanced age, in order, as it is said, to procure an ablebodied woman for the domestic service. He cohabits with this person, now become his daughter-in-law, and frequently has several children by her." So says Coxe[3], and Ker Porter confirms it; yet the Russians will not eat a cock because he is a polygamist.

To polygamy an extensive population has often been attributed. Strabo[4] says the Persians had many wives and concubines; *propaganda subolis gratia*. Suetonius[5] says it was the intention of Julius Cæsar to introduce this practice for the same purpose. Diodorus Siculus[6] accounts for the populous-

[1] vol. 1. p. 74.

[2] Coitus cum scorto—sicut coitus cum uxore sua et de jure, &c. lib. 7. c. 5. p. 808.

[3] book 4, c. 1. [4] lib. 15. t. 2. p. 491. [5] lib. 1. c. 52.

[6] lib. 1. The priests had but one wife.

ness of Egypt by polygamy, as Duhalde[1] does for the multitudes in China. So does Bolingbroke for the *prodigious number* of the Jews; "if we believe them to have been real, to that prodigious and constant increase of people which a well-ordered polygamy caused[2]."

> "In pious times, ere priestcraft did begin,
> Before polygamy was made a sin;
> When man on many multiplied his kind,
> Ere one to one was cursedly confin'd."

Such doctrines we should not expect from Bolingbroke. He adds, "this sort of polygamy is quite conformable to the law of nature, and provides the most effectual means for the generation and education of children." Why did not Bolingbroke consummate this rhapsody by introducing Solomon, the wisest of men, in all his glory amidst his many hundred wives and concubines?

> "Thus Israel's monarch after heaven's own heart,
> His vigorous warmth did variously impart
> To slaves and wives."

Lastly, Bolingbroke defends polygamy by the authority of Moses against Cecrops.

Barbeyrac[3] imagines that polygamy caused an overflowing population.

Bruce[4] supports polygamy and Mahomet. He says it was established by him "for the welfare of

[1] vol. 2. p. 10.

[2] Philosophical Works, vol. 4. p. 112. Madan, in Thelypthora, endeavours to honour the Jewish institutions as greatly tending to population. chap. 10.

[3] Notes on Puffendorff, lib. 6. c. 1. p. 19.

[4] Travels, vol. 1. p. 291.

his people. He did not permit a man to marry two or three or four wives, unless he could maintain them: then he was interested for the rights and ranks of the women. In Jedda, the people almost destitute for the necessaries of life can only marry one wife: from this arises the want of people." He adds, that in Arabia Felix, where there are plenty of provisions, men may marry four wives: "hence people are increased in a four-fold ratio by polygamy." How this exhibits Mahomet's solicitude for the rights or ranks of women, when one man is estimated as equivalent to four women, I do not understand. It may be observed that he reduced the value of woman to one half of the cheapened calculation of the Sikhs [1]. Surely that enterprising traveller might as fairly have attributed the scantiness of the population at Jedda to the acknowledged poverty of the country, and the populousness of Arabia Felix to the abundance of the land, as to any difference in the customary marriages of the two countries.

Suppose that polygamy did increase the children of particular fathers, it would remain to be proved that this increased the population of the state, or even the number of births. Chardin says [2], the Mahometan Tartars have many wives, because, say they, these bring us many children, which we may sell or exchange for necessaries. To the same purpose Captain Beaver says [3], among the Naloos "a man's wealth is

[1] The Adi-Grant'h, the Bible of the Sikhs, is said to have been enlarged by twelve men and a half—that is, twelve men and one woman. Sketch of the Sikhs, note, p. 31.

[2] Harris's Collection, b. 3. c. 2. p. 865.

[3] African Memoranda, p. 327.

calculated from the number of his wives." But this only refers to the advantage of particular families; and unless it be proved that there are many more women than men in the ordinary course of generation, (which in another publication I shall show is contrary to fact,) or that those who are wived to polygamists would otherwise have been unmated and sterile, these statements, though true, are nugatory as to the main question. They only prove that the powerful appropriated the rights of others—and that the richest, by taking many wives, reduced the less rich to live bachelors.

Suppose that the polygamist has many children, how does this advance population? Niebuhr states[1] the increase of families by polygamy—but he says that the mortality is excessive among the children, and that the number of children sinks many parents into great misery. The present king of Persia is reported to have had fifty sons when he was twenty-five years old. These, if they should escape the suspicion of a brother's vengeance, will probably add nothing to the numbers of the state; nor will the brood of his courtiers be more lasting;—who no doubt, in their generation, imitate his majesty. We may, however, discuss this subject in a higher tone, and deny that polygamy promotes population even in the appropriating families. Eton states[2] that Christian parents have more children than the Mahometans who adopt polygamy. Nor can this be attributed to the general decline of the Turkish institutions and government; for Ricaut[3], who admired

[1] t. 2. c. 5. [2] Survey of the Turkish Empire, p. 275.
[3] Turkish Empire, b. 2. c. 21.

Mahomet and the Porte and polygamy, wrote long ago: "his [Mahomet's] main consideration was the increase of his people; knowing that the greatness of empire and princes consists more in the numbers and multitude of the people than in the extent of their dominions:" and having descanted on the beginning of the world, and the increase of mankind, and polygamy among the Jews, he concludes, "Through sorcery and witchcraft these marriages [the Turkish] are now observed not to be so fruitful and numerous as is the marriage bed of a single wife." Every moral reason, that is in this case every reason, opposes the probable increase of people by polygamy. When the discipline of Turkey was pre-eminent, and the Mahometans triumphed, their success justified all their institutions to uninquiring minds. Their fortune has been for some time checked; and men now begin to learn that the Mahometans were numerous not because they were polygamists, but in spite of this evil. Volney [1] sanctions the opinion of Montesquieu, whom in general he does not favour, that polygamy is one cause of the depopulation of Turkey.

To promote marriage, various schemes have been proposed: and I repeat, that in giving a brief history of opinions, I trust my own may not be prejudged. Honours and rewards, pains and penalties, prerogatives and exceptions have been multiplied, to quicken the disposition of men to matrimony. The penal parts of legislature are generally esteemed the most operative, and I shall begin with them. Plato proposed to fine bachelors;

[1] Il a eu raison de dire que la polygamie étoit une cause de depopulation en Turquie. Voyage en Syrie, t. 2. p. 327.

and agreeably to the usual affluence of his language, he varies the penal age from 35 in one book[1] to 37 in another[2]. I shall not here add instances from Grecian politics, having already noticed them: and I shall only, for the same reason, subjoin one from the Roman institutions, on account of its peculiarity. I allude to that law admired by Montesquieu[3], which prohibited unmarried women from the use of certain ornaments.

Nor has modern Europe wanted politicians who would inflict on recreant bachelors the vengeance of the law. Dr. Short proposed that fines should be imposed on bachelors, and that their amount should be applied to support the married poor. Decker[4] proposed fines also; but not, he says, to encourage marriages, but because the expenses of bachelors in respect to their fortunes admit of it. How is that discovered? At least it is as plausible that those who marry are equal to the charges of the connexion as those who do not are incompetent: for the improvident marriages of some, or the licentious or unsocial lives of others, are extrinsic to general legislation. In other countries of modern Europe similar laws have been recommended. Montesquieu[5] laments that Europe still wants laws to promote the propagation of the species: and Valazé[6] would supply his intimation by fixing the penal age of bachelors at thirty years.

[1] de Legib. lib. 4. p. 835. [2] Ibid. lib. 6. p. 860.

[3] L'Esprit des Loix, liv. 23. c. 26.

[4] On Trade, p. 88. Dr. Price talked of a tax on celibacy paying off the national debt, p. 115. Great effects from little causes. If he were not the reviver of the sinking fund, this would appear a joke. But an enthusiast never wanted an expedient.

[5] L'Esprit des Loix, liv. 23. c. 21. [6] Loix Penales, p. 207.

To the penal may follow the compulsory. Frederic the *great*[1] carried off a number of young Saxon women and married them to Prussians provided by the crown. A lunatic king[2] said,

"——————Let copulation thrive:
To't luxury, pell mell, for I lack soldiers."

Yet probably these truly royal weddings were as little productive as Mons. Beausobre's advice, who recommended Frederic, in order to assist population, to decree *que les hommes n'épousent des femmes très-désagréables.*

Under the head of compassion may be classed parish marriages: and as some consider that the poor-laws increase the people, they may be here mentioned. A girl is pregnant; the parish officers, finding that the woman will be chargeable, pursue the reputed father. If taken, he is menaced by magistrates and churchwardens. Crabbe exhibits this judicial achievement and happy consummation:

"Near her the swain, about to bear for life
One certain evil, doubts 'twixt war and wife:
But while the falt'ring damsel takes her oath,
Consents to wed, and so secures them both."

How magistrates and parish officers, who must be supposed good protestants and to know the liturgy of the established church, can oblige such parties to marry, is strange, if indeed all orders did not prove that they are religious by rote, or rather in the abstract. But it is still stranger that they do not see, that eventually this must increase the evil; and that the alternative penalty of a wife, if the man should not

[1] Wraxall's Memoirs, vol. 1. p. 214. [2] Lear.

divorce himself by sudden flight, must increase the number of the poor. They may think with Margaret [1], "Is not marriage honourable in a beggar?" but they cannot say with Priuli, "Get brats and starve with them:" for the brats and their parents must be supported by those persons whose officers promoted such marriages.

Bounties on marriages have been numerous and not unknown to many countries: in 1767 a number of young maidens were portioned in Florence on account of the happy delivery of the grand duchess [2]. For every reason it would have been better to have made the donation to women lately delivered. At Naples, in the year following [3], 20,000 ducats given by that city to the new queen were apportioned among 200 young women. In 1767 the queen of Denmark [4] ordered 30 rix dollars to each of twenty-five women, in order to enable them to marry: yet two years preceding, in 1765, the king of Denmark [5] forbade first and second lieutenants in the army to marry, unless they had 150 crowns exclusive of their pay.

The court and crown of France have been great populators. Madame de Pompadour says in her memoirs, that she prevailed on the king to apply 600,000 livres designed for a *fête* on account of the duke of Burgundy's marriage, towards the marrying young women. She adds, that M. de Billeuse, who was fond of calculating every thing, (the precursor of Mr. Colquhoun,) estimated that the marriages would yield annually 20,000 citizens to the monarchy. Louis XV.

[1] Much Ado about Nothing. [2] Annual Register, 1767, p. 66.
[3] Ibid. 1768, p. 147. [4] Ibid. 1767, p. 151. [5] Ibid. 1765, p. 75.

patronized population; and, following the policy of his predecessors, ordained that marriage should exempt his subjects from military conscription[1]; for this mode of recruiting is not of consular or imperial, but of royal origin. Thus he reduced premature marriages; which of course had no effect but making the poor poorer, and deaths more numerous. This great monarch was consequential throughout; while he afforded bounties for marriages, he exhausted the sources of the ordinary revenue, and effected a national bankruptcy: and while he invited foreigners to France[2] by assigning them lands rent-free for fifteen years, he repelled their entry by misrule; nay expelled his people by violations of personal liberty, and by breaking those fundamental laws by which, in the language of the parliament of Paris, *he had himself ascended the throne*[3]. This language preceded the revolution twenty years.

Some governments of Europe have distinguished their costly mismanagement by a bounty on soldiers' marriages. Observe the conduct of the Romans, who were eminent for their military science. Soldiers and wives they held incompatible: and it is remarked among the extraordinary means adopted under a declining population, after the state had long merged

[1] Les mariages prematurés étoient multipliés par la crainte des loix militaires. Depere.

[2] Annual Register, 1766, p. 132.

[3] In 1768 the parliament in a remonstrance told the king, "there are two sorts of laws; those of the king and those of the kingdom: and that by the latter he ascended the throne," &c. Yet we must suppose that the legitimate government ought to be supported at any expense, &c.

into a monarchy, that Pertinax [1] admitted women to associate with the soldiers. Modern sovereigns have improved on this feeble effort to recruit a consuming people. The empress queen Theresa first suffered the troops to marry [2]. In the year following [3] she enjoined them to marry; helping her ordonnance by increasing the pay of all serjeants and corporals by three kreutzers a day for each child.—Thus, she stated, she intended to supply the loss of men in the wars.

The empress Catharine of Russia, among her other maternal achievements, was a great friend to population. Beside lessening the punishment for adultery, and portioning damsels, while she squandered forty millions on her own sterile amours [4], she encouraged the marriages of her soldiers. Mr. Tooke informs us [5], "according to an estimate made some years ago, it was reckoned that in the field regiments alone, and a few garrisons, about eighteen thousand sons of soldiers are taught and maintained at the expense of the state in schools appointed for that purpose.—Similar institutions are kept up for all the regiments of the guards." And how much more does every child so educated cost than a peasant's son? and just so many does this institution deduct from the whole population. In 1765 [6], orders were read in England at the head of the regiments of foot guards and troops of horse, signifying that those who were lawfully married

[1] Herodian, lib. 3. p. 172. Libanius, Orat. Funeb. Opera, p. 284.
[2] Annual Register, 1767, p. 4. [3] Ibid. 1768, p. 35.
[4] Anderson's Sketches of Russia, p. 371. The author is loyal also.
[5] History of the Russian Empire, vol. 1. p. 619.
[6] Annual Register, 1765, p. 149.

might send their wives to the lying-in hospitals, and have their children supported: yet every child so reared cost the price of five children reared in the ordinary way. But what signifies the waste of property or the ruin of the people?—One soldier's son is more valuable in a military monarchy, and in those which depend on standing armies, than many peasants. Military schools, military colleges, serve to promote the separation of soldier and citizen, and with the barrack system determine the caste of arms. Such bounties are ruinous and absurd. As specimens of sentimentality in courts, they are like Xerxes' tears—he wept, because in a hundred years not one should be alive of all his military array: yet was he driving them with many myriads more to swift destruction. They resemble the same Catharine's deeds in Poland; who while she massacred the people, endowed an orphan-house [1].

Legislators having called maids and youths together by proclamations and bounties, and having thus far exculpated themselves from the senseless censure of their indifference to the great command;—the state wives being pregnant, their parturition became a subject of national solicitude. The cantons of Switzerland sympathized with the kingdoms of Europe—they dreaded depopulation: to counteract this calamity, it was proposed to stop emigration—introduce strangers—particularly midwives;—portion maidens, and erect foundling hospitals. Here we behold a display of great vigour: but these oligarchies entirely omitted to reform their governments. Tweddell saw the aristocrats of Switzerland as they were and are.

[1] Annual Register, 1765, p. 95.

Their politics at home and abroad are abominable. They hire out their citizens to be the body guards of tyrants, to assist them in their flagitious conquests. Remember, when you revile the French for their outrages in Switzerland, (and they were hideous,) that the Swiss hired their citizens to Louis XV; and that they were eminently active in subjecting the brave Corsicans to the French crown [1]. The Swiss oligarchies, while they dreaded depopulation, did not withdraw their troops from supporting tyrants and conquerors; nor did Berne reduce the taxation of the Pays de Vaud [2]: nor did this overruling canton liberate its own people; and they fell before the French. Had Switzerland been free, the French would not have conquered Switzerland: without giving them any credit for forbearance, they would not have attempted the conquest. Enough of this. *La Société Economique de Berne* saw, or thought they saw, depopulation; and like all such societies in Europe, which subsist by overlooking the causes of public evil, they proposed breeding by bounty, and nurturing by artifice.

The same course, but much more flagitiously, the Swedish king Gustavus III. pursued. This man, who blossomed a hypocrite, having by his agents imposed a belief that an accidental scarcity was the act of the senate; and having by the remaining friends of the old tyranny, who conspired in 1756 [3] to massacre in

[1] See Annual Register, 1768, p. 60.

[2] In Bibliotheque de l'Homme Publique, t. 5. p. 47, it is said the inhabitants paid 30 per cent. thus:

le lods	16
la dime	10
encense	2
droits de patrage, &c.	2

[3] Mably, Droit Publique, t. 2. p. 284.

the diet all the senators and ministers who were attached to their country and the republic, gained the army; he attained despotism, and he exercised it even while he spoke of tyrants, as if his actions rivalled the deeds of Harmodius. This Gustavus was a populator also: he established medicine-shops, lying-in hospitals, foundling-hospitals, and the like.

England of course could not resist the common impulse: yet I should be unjust in omitting that here such institutions have not originated with royalty. Sir W. Harper [1] in Queen Elizabeth's reign left a property to be applied to the marrying young maidens; and the Earl of Buckinghamshire [2] contributed to the same purpose. London possessed a lying-in hospital of some standing, as may be learned by the oath required of the midwives who might have baptized infants *in extremis*.—They were sworn, that in performing this sacrament, "ye shall not in any wise use or exercyse any manner of wychecraft, charmes, sorcerye," &c. We now come to foundling hospitals.

Addison in the Guardian, No. 105, recommended foundling hospitals: and he urged the English by stating that "there are at Paris, Madrid, Lisbon, Rome, and many other large towns, great hospitals built like our colleges." He might have displayed various coincidences between foundling hospitals and our colleges. Twenty-six years after this intimation by Addison, Captain Thomas Coram after seventeen years exertion effected the establishment of a foundling hospital. I think we may lament his success; at least I may here say that men and states should well consider

[1] Annual Register, 1762, p. 84.

[2] Ibid. 1762, p. 71.

not only the good that may be done and the evil that may be prevented, but the good which cannot be done, and the evil which must result from all establishments: for it seems that as men grow old, establishments grow worse.

Foundling hospitals, as a means of increasing the people, are among the least rational of human institutions. For the facts.—In the Gazette of Deux Ponts, April 9, 1771, it is stated, that of 108 children received in the foundling hospital of Normandy, 104 died. In Valencia [1], about the year 1786, of 332 159 died. And Swinburne says [2] that in Cordova 500 chidren are annually lost in the foundling hospital of that city. Tooke states [3] that from the establishment of foundling hospitals in Russia in 1786, during a period of twenty years, of 37,607 children received, only 7,100 survived, or four fifths perished. In Ireland also, up to the half-year ending the 8th of July, 1797, the mortality amounted to three fourths of the number of children received. This is to sacrifice to Juno and Moloch on the same altar. What a mighty destruction! how much more excessive than the ruin of slaves in their swiftest state of decline! for not more than a fourth of them perished during the first four years after their arrival in our West India islands. The deaths in the foundling hospital of Dublin, and which exceeded the waste of life in similar institutions in the despotism of Russia, are referable to the aggravated

[1] Townsend's Travels in Spain, vol. 2. p. 322.

[2] Travels in Spain, p. 305.

[3] History of Russia, vol. 1. p. 585: and those of St. Petersburg the same, p. 586.

misrule and total disregard of the higher orders of Ireland, to every national concern in that insulted degraded country, except when some sectarian or sordid interest quickens their attention. The eighth report of the Board of Education justifies this observation by the following statement, "that except when offices of emolument were to be disposed of, it was difficult out of nearly two hundred governors to procure the attendance of five once a quarter." A year or two ago the mortality was so great, that a bill was brought into parliament to restrain the reception of children during the winter: and I believe no child is now admitted without a certificate ascertaining its parents. If so, it is no longer a foundling hospital.

Though it is not easy to understand how so many deaths could be effected, except by a determination to destroy in those who should preserve, yet no care, no anxiety could prevent in such institutions a great mortality. The mere transfer of an infant child from its mother's bed to the hospital must be pernicious. Besides, infants require the utmost solicitude: any casual claim on a mother's attention often proves fatal to the child. A proverb at Montpellier [1] is explanatory: "The season of rearing silk-worms sends many children to paradise:" meaning that this office divides the mother's care with her children. There are other causes of neglect; a foundling is reputed a beggar's bastard; the nurses are not the most select; they are paid little and worked much. Tooke, with a design to eulogize, says that in the foundling hospitals in Russia

[1] Morgue in the National Institute on the population of Montpellier.

each nurse suckles two babes: and this may be praised; for Boisgelin, speaking of Copenhagen, says that each nurse suckles two, and never more than three children. What must be the consequence, when a single stranger must perform the part of three mothers? Musæus says[1] the eagle brings forth three—two live, and one is reared: —the reason assigned for this mortality is the difficulty of providing for the eaglets; or, as Mr. Malthus would say, the pressure of the birds on the means of subsistence.

Those who doubt the populating influence of foundling hospitals insist on their moral effects. Mercier, in his Tableau de Paris, says[2] that since the establishment of foundling hospitals in Paris, infanticide has been rare: yet Boisgelin, speaking of the more serious crimes at Stockholm, mentions child-murder, though a foundling hospital exists in that city. But suppose that such receptacles lessened what is called infanticide—do they not occasion a suite of vices? Mr. Grahame says[3], "Foundling hospitals, although they may multiply illegitimate births, do not multiply instances of illicit intercourse." That is to say, illegitimate births may not proceed from illicit intercourse. They prevent marriage, encourage licentiousness, and continue it:—the woman who erred and suffered the penalty of rearing the fruit of her transgression, would probably have ceased to sin; but relieve her of her child, and she seduces or is again seduced. Thus it happens that two or three lewd mothers and their consuming brood,

[1] Ὁς τρια μεν τικτει, δυω δ' εκλεπει εν δε αλεγιζει. Aristot. de Animalibus, lib. 4. c. 6. t. 1. p. 864.

[2] p. 237.

[3] On Population, p. 227.

waste the means of a virtuous family. Suppose the children die; all that was expended on them is lost. If some be reared, what is the profit? Children so reared are pale, feeble and sickly. If we consider foundling hospitals as receptacles for spurious children, they deprive crimes of inflicting their own punishments: or if they be considered as a resource to the lower orders, they encourage improvidence, tend to lessen the love of parents and children, and to separate generation from paternity. Those children who escape the various deaths that beset them, and pass abroad, are without kindred, attachment, or character. A report of one of the foundling hospitals in France states [1], that the young persons so reared became vagabonds. Foundling hospitals may prevent a few violent deaths; but this is gained at the expense of many lives, and some licentiousness. The account stands thus: A few may be saved from individual violence, that many may suffer by a sentimental confederacy. Nothing is more startling than infanticide:—but in hope of escaping this crime, should we authorize a tenfold mortality? Compare the deaths in foundling hospitals with the ordinary loss of infants, superadding those wilfully destroyed, in any country at any time, and it will appear that one child has been saved at the loss of one hundred. And though in offices of humanity the expense can hardly be calculated, yet here we must consider this particular; for the expense is increased not for the preservation but the waste of mankind.

This requires further observations. Supposing that foundling hospitals induce illicit intercourse and preg-

[1] Annual Register, 1761, p. 133.

nancy and the premature death of children, without estimating the charges of the hospital establishment, they occasion a public loss. A child costs so much before he is born, as the mother by her pregnancy is prevented from earning:—a child is then so much capital: if he die, he is so much capital lost; and a child preserved is so much capital redeemed. Mrs. Newby, matron of the lying-in hospital, it is said [1], recovered five hundred still-born children. She then was a benefactor to the amount of the cost of their production: or more properly speaking, according to the language of debtor and creditor, their restoration is to be deducted from the expenditure of the establishment; for on this view expense and life are convertible terms. Let it not be supposed that I mean by this statement that the 500 saved were added to the whole population of the state; I should rather say, supposing the pregnancy of each mother of the 500 children reduced her labour *3l.*, and that a child cost *50l.* before he can provide for himself, the saving of 500 still-born children was equal to the production of 30 men. I state this as merely explanatory of my views, without any regard or interest respecting accuracy—which is not attainable. In the West Indies it has been the subject of a very nice estimate; and though it comes from an unholy source, I subjoin it. Monsieur Dauberteuil says [2] that the loss during the last three months pregnancy and fifteen months nursing causes

[1] Highmore's Pietas Londinensis, p. 202. In the Annual Register, 1805, p. 389, the number of recovered still-born children is stated at one hundred.

[2] Steele and Dickson, p. 246.

a loss of 9*l.* sterling: at ten years the child is worth 44*l.*: at fifteen 60*l.*: having at this period earned 35*l.*

A child then represents as much stock as has been expended on him; therefore his death is a loss to that amount. And it is to be observed, that if from excess of people he could not have been reared, the mere producing him was a loss also, so much labour prevented during parturition being so much lost to the community. If then the death of a child be a loss, how much more must be the death of a man! The first erases the spring from the year, but this blots out the year from the round of time. What a benefactor then is the minister of peace! for every man killed, beside the assassination, is a death cast on posterity: a debt which oppresses the living, whether the expenditure be met by annual taxes, or whether time and taxation interminably unite. But I must restrict myself here to peace, and the peaceful means of preserving human life.

The value of mankind seems to Mr. Malthus very inconsiderable: he says, in his loose dialect [1], "The effects of the dreadful plague in London in 1666 were not perceptible fifteen or twenty years afterward. It may even be doubted whether Turkey and Egypt were upon an average much less populous for the plagues which periodically lay it waste." The inference implied is false: for even if London recovered its number and its opulence in twenty years, its progress in both was retarded. The operation of diseases on Turks and Egyptians, who are afflicted by a tyranny which is so much more pernicious than bodily infirmities, is

[1] vol. 1. p. 566.

not easily estimated. Indeed in a great measure the plague may be referred to despotism; for the plague is of moral, not of physical origin. The plague was unknown anciently in Asia Minor and at Constantinople even under the Roman tyranny. Despotism induces predestination, heedlessness and apathy. When Guy wrote [1], no precautions were used against it: he says, "When the deaths exceed a certain number, public prayers are offered." Even when Thornton wrote [2], the Greek priests of the hospital constantly sold the clothes of those who perished by the plague, which the government knew and disregarded. At Smyrna, latterly [3], the population has become more cautious and the sale of the clothes of infected persons is a capital offence. This they have learned probably from foreigners resident among them; who, enjoying a portion of freedom in this land of slaves, have an interest in their lives, are proportionably circumspect, and thus they escape the death that surrounds them.

That the Turkish government should neglect the health of its people, and that the people should be indifferent respecting life, is not unaccountable. But careless as the English government always has been respecting the people, it is mysterious why rational measures have not been adopted to prevent the introduction of the plague into England. This country has more than once suffered by that calamity. In 1604 one fifth of the people of London died of the plague [4]. La-

[1] Letter 30.

[2] State of Turkey, vol. 2. p. 213. It is remarkable that in this country of the plague, canine madness is unknown, though dogs abound and feed on the worst garbage. Vol. 2. p. 161.

[3] Hobhouse, Travels, p. 642. [4] Hume's History, vol. 6. p. 14.

zarettos are established in Leghorn, Marseilles, in Venice; and the rules and tariffs of the last seemed to Howard [1] to have regulated all similar establishments in Europe. England has no lazaretto. A proposal was made to build one in England, which was negatived, because, it was said, the profits of the Turkish trade were unequal to erect such an edifice. Nor is this all; as every person who has spoken of the quarantine laws, Howard [2], General Cockburn, &c., have treated them as in the highest degree impotent and absurd [3].

It is among the chief caprices of nations, that one of the greatest improvements in the health and life of European society was derived from the insensate Turks. Inoculation, which Niebuhr says [4] has been practised time immemorial among the Bedoins, was notoriously introduced into England by Lady Wortley Montagu, a century ago, from Constantinople. The destructiveness of the small-pox has been general. The Galla, the Mahas [5], and the Indians bordering on the fur-traders, have suffered considerably from its effects. In 1759 [6], of 4335 burials in Copenhagen, 1079 were the effects of the small-pox. Yet this was less than the mortality of the casual small-pox in London; for it

[1] On Lazarettos, p. 12. [2] Ibid. p. 28 et seq.

[3] Travels, vol. 2. p. 214. See also Medico-Chirurgical Transactions, vol. 6.

A fond theorist might use this indifference as a reason for the escape of the English from the plague; as Hobhouse says, all conjectures respecting this disease attribute the diffusion, *in a great measure, to the terror of the plague.* Travels, p. 642.

[4] Travels, c. 129. [5] Travels of Lewis and Clarke.

[6] Annual Register, 1761, p. 116.

appears that of those so afflicted, 25 in 100 perished, according to the registries of the inoculating hospitals[1]; while only 4 in 100 died, of those who were inoculated. Mr. Malthus could not be ignorant of similar results. He notices them. How? With joy? No. His miserable philosophy, blindfold and blundering, knows not cheerfulness. In answer to Dr. Haygarth, "I am far from doubting[2] that millions and millions of human beings have been destroyed by the small-pox. But were its devastations, as Dr. Haygarth supposes, many thousand degrees greater than the plague, I should still doubt whether the average population of the earth had been diminished by them. The small-pox is certainly one of the channels, and a very broad one, which *nature* has opened for the last thousand years to keep down the population to the level of the means of subsistence: but had this been closed, others would have become wider, or new ones would have been formed." What disastrous doctrine! and how absurd! He supposes that though men should be destroyed by diseases many thousand times more mortal than the plague, the average population on the earth would still be the same. He supposes that always an excess of population crowds the world; which must be destroyed by diseases: and that to provide these is *Nature's* business. Here Nature, the το παν of Mr. Malthus, branches into the *fatal sisters.* If

[1] Highmore's Pietas Londinensis, p. 284. Moore in his History of the Small Pox says, that for the last 30 years of the last century, the annual deaths by the small-pox were from 34 to 36,000 in Great Britain and Ireland.

[2] vol. 2. p. 29.

this be not fatalism, what is folly? Cure one disease, you render another more mortal, or you generate *new ones*. Then the Boards of Health, the education of physicians, all preventives against disease, even attention to health, are ineffectual to add one more to the society of the world. They merely oblige *Nature* to task her ingenuity, or to manifest her power, by inventing new maladies, which shall restore the balance between life and provisions. This certainly exhibits in an interesting and original view *the house of woe*. Plutarch said [1] reprovingly, Some have made panegyrics on vomiting and fever, and have been praised. Mr. Malthus has done more: he has introduced with much applause into political œconomy,

> "————————————all maladies,
> Dropsies and asthmas, and joint-racking rheums,
> Convulsions, epilepsies, fierce catarrhs,
> Marasmus, and wide-wasting pestilence."

And these are among his *materia medica* for purging off the surfeit of population.

It is remembered to the disgrace of the faculty of medicine of Paris, that in 1768 thirty-two voted against twenty-three who wished to tolerate inoculation [2]. And the argument of B. Moseley, physician to the royal military hospital of Chelsea, did astonish many, who proved *à priori*, "that the cow-pox cannot be a preventive of the small-pox [3]." Yet this was sage and humane—exhibiting a great reach of thought—in comparison to the broad channel and minor drains of Mr. Malthus, which Nature and her eternal equiva-

[1] Plutarch. Moral. p. 28. [2] Annual Register, 1768, p. 66.
[3] Preface to "Lues Bovilla."

lents prepare, in order to preserve a *dead* level between subsistence and population. Yet truly, Nature, according to the announcement of her high-priest, is but a sorry artist at destruction. Would not famishing the surplus people as directly and as expeditiously effect her high behests, as cutaneous complaints? And let me ask Mr. Malthus to signify to us under what head of checks the small-pox is to be ranked: for the children of all descriptions of people are affected by it—the rich and the poor. Thus the philosophy of Mr. Malthus, at every turn of his argument, is feeble and confounding. The death of children or adults, forsooth, is no loss; no reduction of life; no preventive of human increase: that whether we be ailing or vigorous, communicating being, or spreading infection, it is the same. Thus the ancients made Æsculapius and Circe brother and sister, and both children of Apollo. How absurd are the Egyptians, who hail the falling of the dew, as this stops the plague! How absurd are the people of Dembia [1], who rejoice at the fall of rain—for this stops the fever! How have all people mistaken their interest, who have respected the preservation of health and the diminution of disease! All wrong, says Mr. Malthus; vain wisdom all, and false philosophy. If you stop the broad channel of this disease, you but divert the current of mortality. If inoculation reduced the deaths from 25 to 4 per cent., so many more children perish by measles and kincough; the *new* disorders, the croup and scarlatina, have been added by nature to the old ones, to effect the necessary waste of human life. As to vac-

[1] Bruce's Travels, vol. 2. p. 452.

cination, this is no doubt worse than all the others; as it has unhappily rendered the small-pox innocuous. Dr. Jenner is much to blame; for who does not see with Mr. Malthus, that as vaccination advanced among the young, Nature was agitated; and from her monstrous womb issued battle and murder and sudden death against all full-grown persons! For breed you will, says Mr. Malthus, beyond the level of the means of subsistence; and die you must in proportion. And yet La Place, a man who knows as much as Mr. Malthus of ratios and geometric and arithmetic, in his *Essai sur les Probabilités* says, "The ratio of the population to the number of births would be increased, if we could diminish or destroy any disease that is dangerous or common:"—he adds, "that Monsieur Duvillard has found that the mean duration of human life is increased more than three years by vaccination."

Whatever preserves health, serves society; for sickness, besides its vexation, occasions a loss of property, a loss of time, and often it involves both the property and the time of others. There is nothing in which the moderns have so improved as in attention to health. The jail fever in Elizabeth's reign [1] was communicated to the court; and the chief baron, sheriff, and three hundred others perished by it.—It appears also, that from fifty to a hundred died annually in the Savoy [2]: yet from 1749 to 1752 inclusive, only four died, in consequence of proper ventilation, &c. In short, the jail fever has disappeared; a disease which Howard attributed to the "want of air and exercise." Other fevers have been greatly reduced. In London a society

[1] State Trials, Preface, p. 14. [2] Annual Register, 1764, p. 47.

to remove fever has subsisted from 1801: they have an hospital to which the afflicted poor are moved. In 1802 the deaths by fevers were reduced from 3000 to 2,201: and in 1807 the mortality was still further reduced to 1,033.—It is also remarkable, that in a Report to the House of Commons, the disease is not only declining, but that the mortality of the infected declines in the hospitals of Dublin, Waterford, Manchester. The Romans built temples to Fever[1] and Fear; we build hospitals to Fever and Confidence. In this respect at least, the superstition of the Pagans has not infected us.

In various ways human life has been an important concern. Captain Cook first proved that health and a tedious navigation were not incompatible.—He circumnavigated the globe, and he restored the crew entire to their country. The Russian Kreusenstern, though absent three years, was equally fortunate. And it is most satisfactory that the complement of men employed in our navy is upheld by one third less expense of lives than formerly.

It seems also that the English are generally more attentive to health than they were in preceding times:—coffee and tea have been in many cases substituted for fermented liquors and ardent spirits. Yet I believe this improvement would have arisen, had China and the plantations never existed: for it originated (though I am aware of the increase of crime) in the more active and intelligent habits of the *whole* people. It has been supposed, though Shakespear's Caliban exists, that an ingenious and a drunken artist is nearly the

[1] Febris fanum palatio, Cicero, t. 4. p. 249. 11.

same: just as a good soil absurdly was reputed injurious to industry. The human mind is strengthened by every advance in ability; and morals and intelligence imply each other. Drunkenness is the grossest of all vices: it is not even sensual, but insensate, and is an epitome both of phrensy and death. Savages are its saddest victims; while the wisest men are the most temperate. The greater temperance where the people have the means of excess, might almost determine their civilization. In this respect the English are far superior to the Russians. It is said that the mortality in St. Petersburg of persons from 20 to 60 years of age is as 817 to 1000: and in London the mortality of persons of the same ages is as 720 to 1000: which is referred to the greater use of ardent spirits in the Russian metropolis[1].

It is therefore my opinion, and it seems a truism, were it not confidently contradicted, that to extirpate a disease, to lessen its virulence, to enable the ailing, to fortify the sound, increases the happiness and the numbers of the people; as the time lost in a sick bed might have been employed in profitable labour, and thus, instead of burthening the labour of others, have added to the common stock; and thus to the means of increasing the people. A sickly family is seldom opulent—seldom numerous:—so of states. And considering men as so much productive industry, a plague or epidemic, which Mr. Malthus calls a necessary channel for carrying off the nuisance of a surplus population, is in fact a national loss, more hideous than the forty thousand bankrupts during the late war.

All inventions, except the very expensive, generally

[1] Tooke's Russia, p. 541.

speaking, which secure life, increase being: and this is acknowledged by the greater price required for those articles which are obtained at a greater hazard of life. Life is a private and public concern. He who secures a labourer's life cheapens the produce of industry, or prevents its enhancement with the general rise of prices. Let those who are insensible to their kind, regard them at least as an item in the general account. Sir H. Davy's safety lamp may be considered an actual discovery of richer mines; for it lessens the labour of extracting coal, by adding all those labourers free of expense, who would otherwise have been destroyed by the fire-damp, and by confirming the whole body of miners in their arduous employment. To substitute machinery for climbing boys, will probably add something to the amount of human life; not only as redeeming victims from premature death, but as promoting humanity. The attention to these wretches, and to the lunatic poor, (nor should the names of Mr. Wakefield and Mr. Bennet be forgotten) evinces increasing humanity; and in my estimation, this proves increasing population. Whatever generally promotes health, promotes life; and with increasing years an increase of people. Some old men are helpless and burthensome—I speak in the unfeeling phrase. However, I have no doubt but that nation whose people are longer lived (all things else being the same) will be more numerously inhabited.—Yet according to Blumenbach, not more than 78 persons in a thousand die of old age. I have spoken long, I hope not tediously, on health, and on the preservation of the lives of young and old: and with some shame I admit, according to

a sordid arithmetic. But thus we must meet the new philosophy. I have considered each child as representing so much stock as was expended in his generation and nurture, which, should he die prematurely, would be lost. I have considered the death of an adult as the destruction of a machine in full work;—and in some respects the loss to population is the same, whether life be ended by intemperance or suicide, by tyranny or violence, on the scaffold or in the field. Each individual

> "————like ripe fruit should drop
> Into his mother's lap, or be with ease
> Gather'd, not harshly pluck'd, by death mature."

Such is my philosophy respecting an important particular connected with the increase of population; in which there is neither contradiction nor dilemma; and in which the best parts of knowledge concur with the charities and affections of mankind.

CHAPTER II.

Further means that have been adopted to increase the people by tributes of men and women—by total transfers of people. Catharine of Russia's ruinous projects—Mr. Malthus's projects—Sir John Sinclair's, &c.—Agriculture—pasture—manufactures—colonial policy as means of increasing population. Spence's—Southey's—Preston's, &c.—to feed the people with fish. Count Rumford's cookery.—Mr. Gray proposes eating-houses, &c.

MANY attempts have been made to increase the numbers of a state by the introduction of foreigners. The first great cause of this practice was war and conquest. Minos imposed an annual tribute of seven

young men and as many maidens on the Athenians. These seem to have cohabited, and to have increased so much that they became troublesome to the Cretans, who sent them to Delphi. Thence they passed to Italy, and finally settled in Thrace, under the name of Bottiæans. The Turks practised the same impost; exacting from the conquered provinces so many Christian children; with whom they recruited the janisaries. Thus they intended to save their own people, and waste the enemies of their faith. In the same spirit the Protestant charter-shools were established in Ireland; their original object being expressly to increase the Protestants by proselyting the children of the oppressed and persecuted Catholics.

After the *children of the tribute* (for so the Turks called the young recruits from the Christian provinces) we may notice tributary women. It is said that Darius ordered the neighbouring nations to send a stipulated number of women to Babylon, who were to be married to those Babylonians whose wives had perished during the siege [1]. In Turkey, Persia, &c., the mode of recruiting the harams of potentates and chiefs is not at present so summary. They obtain the objects of their wishes after the European manner—money is first exacted; and this, through the wants and wishes of the people, commands men, women and children.

The inhabitants of cities and districts have been transferred to increase the population of provinces and nations, *Roma interim crescit Albæ ruinis* [2].

[1] Herodotus, lib. 3. c. 139. [2] Livius, lib. 1. c. 30.

Ancus Marcius [1] afterward transplanted a whole people to Rome, dividing them among the tribes of the city. The savage hordes of America also, on whom Mr. Malthus has founded his observations on the ravening *nature* of war, having overpowered the enemy, frequently adopt their prisoners into their society. A Mahomet [2], to secure advantages which he had gained, transferred the inhabitants of Podolia to the eastern side of the Danube: Sobieski defeated this policy. Shah Abbas built Ferabad [3]; and to people this intended metropolis, he swept towns and provinces of their inhabitants. This mode of populating effects directly a double destruction, beside its ruinous consequences.

Machiavel [4] says that, to obtain empire, (he ought to have said to sustain freedom, for that is the consideration,) a nation should be populous; that for this purpose two means are applicable—to increase the people by a forcible transfer from abroad; or to win the entry of foreigners by a liberal policy. There is a third which he has omitted, and, for the present, I shall not obtrude it on the reader. I have spoken of the compulsory mode; of the second, or *per amore* of Machiavel I now speak. Mr. Tooke [5] informs us, that Catharine of Russia employed millions of rubles "to increase the population from without." For this purpose, she published apostolically to all

[1] Dion Halicarnassus, lib. 3. c. 37.
[2] Palmer's Life of John Sobieski.
[3] Pietro della Valle, in Pinkerton, vol. 9. p. 51.
[4] Discorsi, lib. 2. c. 3.
[5] History of Russia, vol. 1. p. 621.

nations, in effect, " that her burthen was easy and her service light,"—that she would grant liberty of conscience—land—the means of reclaiming it, and that she would support those who should accede to her proposal, till they reached their destination. In consequence, in 1765 and 1766, multitudes were shipped from different countries, and disembarked in the land of promise, at Cronstad. The Empress, and her sage advisers, were surprised and alarmed that her call was honoured by many. As they landed, they were moved forward and lodged, in huts, at Oranienbaum. By a contagious disease 100,000 were reduced to 40,000, who were incapable of any exertions. This conclusion is not mentioned by Mr. Tooke, but by J. B. Flages [1], who was one of the government agents in this mighty requisition; but Mr. Tooke does inform us, that " no prince in modern times has ever made the subject of population so intimate a concern of government, as the late empress." Wonderful woman! and she established a *tutelary chancery*, whose special care was to regulate these foreign accessions. Yet a worse fate attended the 75,000 Christians, who were transferred from the Crimea to inhabit the country which had been abandoned by the Nogai Tartars. In a few years they were reduced to a tenth; a similar catastrophe attended other schemes of imperial population. This Pallas [2] ascribes to the want of those requisites which the Empress expected. Why did she expect them, unless she had faith in the tales of

[1] Etat de Russie. [2] Voyage, &c. t. 5. p. 5.

Deucalion and Pyrrha? Yet such potentates, and their ministers, and their tutelary chanceries, pursuing schemes impossible, and exhausting as our Botany Bay establishment, rail at reformers; while, Adonis-like, they fall in love with their own furrowed image in the rippling stream. The Empress might as well have expected, that an ukase should prolong her snow palace to a summer residence, as to populate Russia by such practical reveries.

Creation is not among the prerogatives of princes. What Catharine could not effect in her empire, Augustus failed to effect in his. Augustus exhausted provinces to people Nicopolis, that short-lived monument of vanity and victory, which the concentrated rays of Roman majesty could not quicken, even for one age, into vigorous life. Nicopolis, in the reign of Honorius, became the property of one woman; yet, I do not mean to suggest, that corresponding means will not people countries, will not establish cities. Timoleon called on Greece for people, and ten thousand supplied the deficiency: "a proof," says Hume, "that the maxims of ancient policy affected populousness more than riches;" and he speaks of the good effects of those maxims; and all this he justly refers "to ideas of equality." So when the Lombard league wished to construct a rational monument to their glory, they built Alexandria; to people which, they transplanted thither the inhabitants of the surrounding villages, and from the first year of the existence of this city it could send fifteen thousand men into the field. Thus the exertion of freemen was completely successful; while the

actions of despots end with aggravated loss. Can it be otherwise? The Spanish kings expelled Jews and Moors, and transplanted the palatinates, at immense and ruinous expense, into their misgoverned country. While a branch of the same royal house, Don Carlos, king of Naples, was so anxious in his invitation of foreigners, that even Jews were accepted by the edict of 1740; but it was proclaimed by the same royal document, that he would not permit said *Jews*[1], *after the manner of our subjects, to cry about the streets old clothes to sell.*

Various other means have been proposed, for increasing or preserving our population. Mr. Malthus[2], to console mankind, as the angel does Adam, says, that Great Britain may contain in centuries, a treble and thrice happier population than it at present possesses. Wonderful! "It would have made *nature* immortal, and death should have played for lack of work." Taxed, indebted, and tormented, as we are, how is this possible? Mr. Malthus affords an innuendo on improved industry. What industry could effect such a prodigy? Mr. Malthus has proposed also, that agriculture should be promoted by the most perverse and extraordinary measures—Corn laws, and bounties on exportation. And as if this were not abundantly absurd, he would throw all the land into great farms, leaving the labourer to subsist on the wages of labour; for one of his axioms is, "It is quite obvious, that a peasantry which depends principally on its possessions in land[3], must be more ex-

[1] Beawes's Lex Mercatoria, p. 599.
[2] vol. 1. p. 80.
[3] vol. 2. p. 466.

posed to it (scarcity) than one which depends on the general wages of labour." I can only say here, (as the subject comes properly under another head,) that what is an obvious truth to Mr. Malthus, is to me a manifest error; all my experience, and I have some on this point, goes directly to confirm an opposite conclusion—that the labourer is more secure, who has a small portion of land attached to his cottage; and though I am far from admiring Arthur Young's cow system and the like, or insisting that a plot of ground with each cottage could relieve the country from the poor's rates; yet the contrary practice has tended to the increase of paupers. A country labourer without any land, has no locality, no stake, no store, nothing like property to refresh his sight about him; he is a manufacturer, without the pleasures of manufacturing society; and though his wages are not so fluctuating, they are inferior.

Mr. Malthus[1] proposes also the inclosure of land. He says, "It seems to be the clear and express duty of every government to remove all obstacles, and give every facility to the inclosure and cultivation of land." But observe, that this is introduced by stating, "I am inclined to think that we often draw very inconsiderate conclusions against the industry and government of states, from the appearance of uncultivated lands in them." Thus, he hushes governments, before he dares to offer the most obvious advice to the constituted authorities. But he should have told them that they prevent the cultivation of the soil, and the strength and numbers of the people,

[1] vol. 2. p. 217.

by preferring a few officers to the population of the empire. The fact is, that the parliament has no sympathy with the people; otherwise they would facilitate inclosures,—so far, I mean, as not subjecting every tract of common to a special bill, as at present; which prohibits improvement, inasmuch as it imposes a grievous tax on agricultural capital and industry. For instance, the bill for inclosing Holy Island in Northumberland, consisting of 1020 acres of common, cost 1267*l.*[1] Why is there not one general act for inclosure? Because some officers of parliament, the patronage of a few, would lose some fees by this reform.

Sir B. H. Hobhouse does not rise so high into the possibilities of population as Mr. Malthus: he supposes only, "that, if all the waste lands of Great Britain were cultivated, it would contain thirty millions." Yet many think we have cultivated too much, and that capital has been diverted from more profitable pursuits. Nor do I doubt but gentlemen and noblemen farm perniciously, that is, their returns are far beneath their expenses. I do not say, however, that their money, should they withdraw it from agriculture, would be more profitably employed. Sir John Sinclair favours agriculture of course, and no doubt he expects an extensive population in consequence. His summary proposal is, that the English should employ North Britons; and these agriculturists, he concludes, would alone multiply the produce of England *two-fold:* he also proposes that twelve millions be lent to the agricultural interest. Yet while he recommends agriculture and bounties, his countrymen in the Highlands

[1] Board of Agriculture, vol. 6.

follow Cato the Censor's advice, who sententiously preferred pasturing in the first and second degree of utility, placing aration in the fourth[1].

The agricultural and pastoral states have had their times of mutual dominion in England. When the agricultural was preferred, penal laws were passed against sheep-keeping, and the penalties were exacted:—in 1636 Sir Anthony Roper paid a fine of 4000*l.* for having more sheep than were allowed by the law: and long after that time it was the opinion of Fortrey and Davenant[2], that it was "more the national interest of England to employ its land to the breeding and feeding of cattle than to the produce of corn," because "tallow, hides, flesh, wool, are of much greater value abroad, than the like yield of the earth would be in corn."

Besides those who refer all to agriculture, and those who patriotically respect pasture, without sufficiently regarding the state of society and the intercourse of nations; others again are the patrons of manufactures. Sir James Steuart, though distinguishing agriculture, says, "Let it never be said that there are too many manufacturers employed in a country; it is the same as if it were said, there are too few idle persons, too few beggars, and too many husbandmen[3]."

Say refers the misery of Poland to its want of manufactures and commerce; he says, "*Elle reste pauvre et dépeuplée. C'est parce qu'elle borne son industrie à l'agriculture, tandis qu'elle devroit être en même temps*

[1] Cicero de Officiis, lib. 2. t. 4. p. 387.
[2] Works, vol. 2. p. 229.
[3] Political Œconomy, book 1. c. 6.

manufacturière et commerçante[1]." He might as well affirm that Switzerland should become maritime: or, what is equally absurd, state with Michel[2], that "Poland is the granary of Europe because it is the least populous;" for Holland, the most populous country, and least productive of corn in Europe, has been the granary of Europe. Poland was agricultural because it was poor, and it was poor because it was wretchedly governed. Lloyd designated it truly "a government in which the king was nothing, and the people slaves[3]." The Poles are now nearly in the same state as their Scythian progenitors in the time of Herodotus, of whom the historian says, "They sowed corn not to eat, but to sell it[4]." The land is laboured by boors, and what they should receive in necessaries, is seized by their lords and exchanged for foreign luxuries.

While some expect populousness from manufactures, or commerce, or agriculture, Mr. Dawson apprehends still greater effects from colonial policy. He first says, "that if the country was fully supplied with food, the population, which was six millions at the Revolution, in 1810 would be sixty millions instead of twelve millions[5]," which he explains afterwards:—"it has been shown in the fifth section of this chapter, that if there always had been plenty of food, (which would have been the case if importation had been free, and if colonies had been settled in America and Africa for the purpose of raising food,) the number of the people in Britain would, upon common chances, have exceed-

[1] t. 1. p. 18. [2] On Legislature, p. 119.
[3] Bibliotheque de l'Homme Publique, t. 11. p. 83.
[4] Lib. 4. c. 17. [5] p. 156. On the Poverty, &c.

ed sixty millions in the year 1812[1]." After all these, and in direct opposition to them, came Mr. Spence,—though no Spencean except in extravagance,—who insisted that commerce is nothing, or worse than nothing; that England is *totus teres atque rotundus*, and that any external addition but impairs the completeness of our demi-paradise.—This man's book, I believe, reached seven editions.

There are various subdivisions of such grand schemes, as to preserve the transit duties on linen, prohibit the export of wool, limit the foreign sale of cotton-twist, regulate the import of butter and cheese,—that is, tax them,—raise the admissible price of grain into Britain; and particularly, it is the chorus to all the reports to the Board of Agriculture, Let no foreign grain be warehoused in Great Britain. And as some have expressed a wish or hope that all our wastes might become arable, others, in this special time of distress—a time always of projects and fanaticism—propose that the waste lands should be purchased with public money, to be held as national domains, on which the state should establish disbanded soldiers and sailors, and all persons in want of employment. This scheme is patronized by Mr. Southey, who also recommends (the government having been parsimonious the last twenty-five years) as *a means of alleviating the present distress, a liberal expenditure.* Much is added about educating children in the Protestant religion as established by law. And a modern writer in a critical journal where we should be least likely to meet any approximation

[1] P. 191. This is the only extravagant assertion in his book; he is sincere and intelligent.

to the maudlin projects of Mr. Vansittart, proposes planting of churches throughout the land, as a remedy for poor's rates and mendicity.

Mr. Preston, while he advises the extension of husbandry, recommends that three millions sterling should be laid out on a great national road, to relieve the distress and support our population. But beside some graver objections, he should prove to the Rev. Mr. Warner of Bath the utility of roads; for the reverend gentleman condemns them; and even when he is most conciliatory he says, "Allowing thus much, however, I would still contend, we are yet without sufficient proof that the improvement of our public roads is promotive of the real happiness of the people." This sceptic in roads has, however, no doubts of the thirty-nine articles; and in the same year, 1810, he says, that "they [who doubt this compendium of the national religion, and national education] are unrepressed by evidence, unabated by candour, unsatisfied with fact." This reverend preacher had better add one more to the thirty-nine; the mystic Pythagoras has prepared it for him, "Decline highways." Nor is Mr. Warner single in his lament. Dr. Whitaker, vicar of Whalley and rector of Heysham, in his Topography, piteously repines at the good roads of Britain; his reason is "The returns of coroner's inquests within these districts for the last fifty years, would prove, I am persuaded, that the increased number of casualties is much greater than the increase of population." Here is a lover of population with the same sympathies as Mr. Malthus; for Mr. Whitaker, as I have quoted, expressly condemned populousness, and with melancholy lamented

Hunslet, which once enjoyed a *slender and obsequious population.*

Many plans have been adopted or proposed for increasing the people by the mode of feeding them. Fielding hoped that we should be able "to fill the mouths of the poor, if not with loaves, at least with fishes:" but hitherto the Fishmongers' Company, which abhors reform as much as the House of Commons, have defeated every effort towards relieving even the poor of the capital. Count Rumford proposed stews and soups, and in a letter to Majendie he says[1], "I verily believe that the inhabitants of Great Britain might be well nourished, their hunger perfectly satisfied, their health and strength preserved, and the pleasure they enjoy in eating increased, with two-thirds of the food they now consume, were the art of cookery better understood."

Mr. Gray[2], who favours population, differs from all these proposals.—That he favours populousness, read the following paragraph: "The additional population born in a country consisting of the surplus arising from the births exceeding the deaths, has a slower influence on a nation's *circuland*: but the operation of this influence is sure and powerful.—They are indeed just so many new customers, who add to the income of the great body of the old dealers much more than they take away, [then paupers are bankers] stimulate the *circulandary* powers, and operate towards rendering the whole national mass more extensive circulators." One would suppose that after this view the

[1] Society for bettering the Condition of the Poor, vol. 2. p. 338.

[2] On the Happiness of States.

author would give himself little trouble about feeding them, as provisions would of course rise like an exhalation. Yet Mr. Gray proposes to increase the population of Great Britain 500,000 by its inhabitants feeding on horses. This may seem original; though among the various projects about the year 1768[1], in consequence of the high price of provisions, the extirpation of horses was also proposed. To induce the eating of horses, Mr. Gray, *on the Happiness of States, Population, &c.*, says, "that it would tend greatly also to diminish the miseries endured by a generous animal." So much for pathos: but fearing that this would not be sufficiently operative, he praises the daintiness of horse-flesh: to determine which, without appeal, he states, "We have the authority of Tartar epicures for its excellence." These Tartar epicures, according to Rubruquis[2], eat all animals except mice and rats, and even those which die of sickness and old-age. Such are the means suggested by different writers for the improvement of population;—but why might not the greater part of them be simultaneously adopted? Suppose we enabled the farmers, by loans and bounties, and Scotch stewards, to cultivate superlatively,—that we settled all the vagrant and poor in fens made salubrious, and on moors made productive,—that we advanced our home trade and manufactures by obstructing the approaches of foreign commerce,—built churches, impaired by-roads, and stopped the leading ones,—required our colonies to act the Grecian daughter to Great Britain, and finally place Mr. Gray's

[1] Annual Register, 1768, p. 194.

[2] Pinkerton, Travels, &c. vol. 7. p. 30.

horses in Count Rumford's soup-kettles;—were all these adopted, then would England be the envy of nations and the admiration of the world, for her people would be as the sands of the sea.

CHAPTER III.

Modes of checking or destroying population—emasculation—absolute celibacy. Mr. Malthus—Tibet—celibacy of priests, &c.—protracted celibacy by law—custom. Mr. Malthus and Swiss political peasant. Mr. Malthus advises late marriages—praise of the Norwegians, that they are better off than the English, exposed—his sermon on marrying, &c. Polyandry. Abstinence of married people from cohabiting—total separation—protracting the time of suckling children—abortion—infanticide—exposing children—infants employed in manufactures—selling children—Spartan Cryptia. Persecutions—depopulation by Highland proprietors unparalleled—monopolies tend to depopulate—bad government—civil war—foreign war—conquests. Slavery injurious—destroyed the population at Rome—Servile wars. Mistake of Mons. Say respecting the cheapness of slaves' work. Mr. Malthus supposes in all countries, except West Indies, slaves will support their population—False—by different examples—as slavery destroys, liberty restores population.

At present, populousness is rather dreaded than hoped. This is not altogether a new sentiment; for Hippodamus, the Milesian legislator[1], Phædon of Corinth[2], Plato[3], and Aristotle[4], have expressed their apprehensions of an excess of people. In my opinion, the existing alarm has no foundation, and merely evinces an ordinary fluctuation of public opinion.

[1] De Repub. lib. 2. c. 7. Aristot.

[2] See Bodin de la République, p. 546.

[3] De Republica, lib. 5. p. 657. de Legib. lib. 5. p. 847.

[4] De Republica, lib. 7. c. 16.

What we wanted we persist in wistfully demanding, while the completion of our wishes often surfeits the appetite. It has also happened, that lofty expressions respecting population were inordinately protracted; while the present contemptuous language concerning the many, as that men are a nuisance, does not so much express an opinion as a defiance: yet it must be observed, that mercenary despotism has assisted this vilifying language. Schiller said, The people, so powerful and conspicuous in ancient times, are now little more than an abstract idea. Since he wrote they are less, for monarchies have increased at the expense and extinction of commonwealths. I proceed to state various obstructions to population. The first in effect is emasculation: this the Gheyssiquas practise on themselves, which different travellers ascribe to an intention of preventing an extraordinary increase of their families.

After this I may mention celibacy, which in some countries is honoured. Buchanan mentions a tribe who distinguish with temples and offerings those who die unmarried[1]. In Tibet it is powerfully recommended; and the especial country of the Grand Lama seems more perversely governed, civilly and religiously, than even that of the Pope, particularly in preventing population. Tibet is the country of checks. Here is a world formed according to the *exemplar* in Mr. Malthus's mind; here is check and countercheck; and Mr. Malthus adds, "Tibet is, perhaps, the only country where these habits are universally encouraged by the government, and where to repress rather than

[1] Pinkerton, Travels, vol. 8. p. 677–680.

to encourage population seems to be a public object[1]." Yet this country is poor and beggarly.

Whatever caused the institutions of this ecclesiastical country, it is probable that celibacy enjoined by the Catholic church had no regard to restricting the numbers of the people. As polygamists, through jealousy, employ eunuchs in their harams, and as Asiatic tyrants have used the same contemptible and envious wretches as their ministers of state,—so the papacy separated, by celibacy, its agents from all civil and kindred affections; the priests were not permitted to marry, that they might be *papists*; and monasteries, or spiritual barracks, were built and encouraged, to dissociate the spiritual soldiery from all lay intercourse. As men were subtracted from society, women were removed also; just as in India, when a husband died, a wife was burned. All these practices, though for a different purpose, checked population; and whether it will surprise Mr. Malthus or not, it increased the poor, for it increased the idle. The celibacy of any description of persons could not retard population; for society might be divided into breeders and workers, and population advance:—celibacy must be excessive, to withdraw so many as to leave insufficient breeders to support the stock. When Lorenzo de Medici, on an envoy from Cairo asking him how so few madmen were at Florence, pointed to a monastery, saying "We shut them up in such houses," his jocularity was beneath the evil; for such houses and establishments are a bounty on the worst infatuation, which not only withdraws so many from contributing to society, but

[1] vol. 1. p. 237.

withdraws so much and so many from the state, as those monkeries and nunneries require to maintain them. Thus, if if we should say that Spain had ten millions of people, of which 200,000 were of the sacred order, we should, in speaking of effectives, deduct with the 200,000 all those who contributed to their support; so that the effective force of the country, instead of ten would not be nine millions; whereas, if these 200,000 monks were citizens under a tolerable government, instead of being a reduction of power and numbers, they, on the contrary, would effectually multiply both. This sort of celibacy is pernicious to population, as it wastes produce, and makes no return. Similar, or connected with monkeries as affecting population, is the custom in Catholic countries, particularly where the law of primogeniture triumphs in its iniquity, of sending the younger females to nunneries, that they may not impair the family fortune by requiring a dowry, nor *disgrace* their family by a plebeian marriage. This is a sample of the connexion of church and state. These sad sisterhoods and holy fraternities, the eulogy of Mr. Burke, have been restored by the twice restored Louis the Eighteenth:—the revolution swept away the nuisances, Louis labours to re-establish them. Yet Louis the Fifteenth passed an ordonnance directing that no religious community should receive a novice under the age of twenty-four[1]; he should have doubled the age, and thus approached the permissive years of an officiating Pythoness. I should observe that celibacy and libertinism are frequently companions; the husband of none is often the paramour of many.

[1] Annual Register, 1766, p. 25.

Next to absolute celibacy is protracted celibacy. Edmonton says that in the Zetland islands, "no man was allowed to marry who had not fifty pounds Scots of free gear to set up house upon, or some lawful trade whereby to subsist, nor such as cannot read, and is in some way capable to demean himself as a christian master of a family." The peasants in Berne are obliged to possess warlike arms and accoutrements before they can obtain permission to marry. This Mr. Malthus[1] admires. Yet he does not expressly advise any legal enactment against marriages. He remembered, perhaps, that Paul had placed forbidding to marry among *the doctrines of devils;* therefore he adopts the pastoral advice of the same apostle, "He that marrieth doth well, but he that marrieth not doth better." This truly is the professor's text.

Mr. Malthus seems much surprised that his discoveries had not been anticipated:—the surprise is, that such reveries ever occurred to any one. Mr. Malthus, however, found a kindred spirit in the mistress of an inn at Jura; but he encountered a rare political œconomist in the person of a peasant, who officiated as guide in the same place[2]. He said "early marriages might really be called *le vice du pays*;" and he thought a law should be enacted, by which men of forty should only be allowed to marry, and then only to *vieilles filles*. This genius married very young; and as with his superiors, his feelings pointed his philosophy. Mr. Malthus's conclusion is worth quoting verbatim. "The only point in which he failed as to his philosophical knowledge of the subject, was in confining his rea-

[1] vol. 1. p. 412. [2] vol. 1. p. 417.

sonings too much to barren and mountainous countries, and not extending them into the plains." Thus Mr. Malthus, who knows "each hill, and dale, and bushy dell of this tall wood," for *le vice du pays* reads *le vice du monde*. We shall therefore leave the Swiss, who, according to the hostess and the guide, resemble the people of Abdera, who plagued with madness, chanted the Andromeda of Euripides, and particularly the verse "Oh! love, tyrant of gods and men[1]."

Mr. Malthus recommends late marriages; and for bad prose let me substitute the verses of an original poet[2]:

"If poor, delay for future want prepares,
And eases humble life of half its cares;
If rich, delay shall brace the thoughtful mind
T'endure the ills that even the happiest find."

Mr. Malthus says also, that women would cheerfully and readily acquiesce, if they could look forward with just confidence to marriage at twenty-eight or thirty. This, I find, is the matrimonial age by law in Formosa[3]. I doubt the benefit of this regulation, were it practicable. It seems probable to me, when society is numerous, that some should not marry, or marry old, while others marry young; I do not mean boys

[1] Lucian quotes the verse in his ridicule of historiographers. Opera, p. 347.

[2] Crabbe's Poems, p. 71. So wrote Ovid;

Nubere si qua voles, quamvis properantibus ambo
Differ; habent parvæ commoda magna moræ.

Fasti, lib. 3.

[3] Ferguson, on Civil Society, quotes a collection of Dutch voy-

ages.

and girls, but in fresh maturity[1]. Mr. Malthus, in ardour for his preventive check and late marriages, forgets that late children are early orphans. Nor do I know one evil in society more lamentable, or more destructive, than children deserted by the death of their parents: few care for them, and they are equally heedless of themselves. I have shown the effects of celibacy in Tibet; I shall show the operation of late marriages in a country greatly vaunted by Mr. Malthus.

He says[2], "I believe that Norway is almost the only country in Europe where a traveller will hear any apprehension of a redundant population, and where the danger to the happiness of the lower classes of the people from this cause is in some degree seen and understood." To effect this, he says[3] "there are so many farms, having so many houses, according to the size of the farms, and that until one of these houses becomes vacant, no marriage can take place; the priests have also a negative, and may refuse to marry those who have not a probable means of supporting a family." Mr. Malthus says, "a redundant population is thus prevented from taking place, instead of being destroyed after it has taken place." And he contrasts the superior state of the Norwegians to the Swedes, referring the advantage of the former, when the Swedes were starving in 1799, to those preventive checks employed by the Norwegians. I do not deny this statement, except its generality in one case

[1] Sera juvenum Venus, eoque inexhausta pubertas: neque virgines festinantur: eadem juventa, similis proceritas, pares validique miscentur. [2] vol. 1. p. 235. [3] vol. 1. p. 310, 311.

and its specification in the other. Could not Mr. Malthus raise his view a little higher? Could he not perceive that the mighty evil was the mad government of that king, who is now the only unrestored of all the fallen legitimates; of his despotism furiously abused; of [1] mismanagement infinitely aggravated; of a luxurious [2] aristocracy and more luxurious court; of a people of course imitating the heedlessness and prodigality of their superiors, who would drink though they should starve? This very people, who submitted without a murmur to the despotism of Gustavus the Third, repeatedly resisted the attempts of the same Gustavus to prevent private distillation. These circumstances just as rationally account for the misery of nations, as whether they eat out of a platter or a

[1] This stupid government has been these seventy years prohibiting ruffles, wines, &c. See Annual Register, 1770, p. 45. When I was in Sweden edicts were issued against coffee. Last year these edicts have been renewed; though coffee, being a cheap and wholesome substitute for spirits, was a double good, saving of grain, &c.

[2] The whole state is deranged. Dr. Thomson in his late Travels observes, that in 1772 Stockholm contained 72,442 inhabitants; in 1812 it contained 72,652. He remarks with much surprise that in 1730 there were 60 bakers, and in 1797 only 32; and that millers had declined from 44 to 20, though goldsmiths, jewellers, painters, &c. had increased. Here we find, with the increase of nobles, luxuries gaining ground on necessaries. There is a passage in Plutarch which may reveal the mystery to Dr. Thomson. "Would we could content ourselves with those things that are necessary for the life of man! But excess and daintiness hath engendered usurers, as the same hath bred goldsmiths, silversmiths, confectioners, perfumers, dyers of gallant colours." I quote an old English version, to prove that I do not frame the quotation for the purpose.

dish, or marry at twenty-eight or thirty, or the like. The Norwegians were a considerate people; and the English ministry, in their scheme of liberation, has transferred them from a bad to a worse government. Observe too, that in Norway there was no law which compelled the farmers to furnish post horses to travellers; which Mr. Malthus [1] admits, according to the Swedish œconomists, is, as I have stated, a waste of labour in horses and men equal to 300,000 tons of grain. In Norway [2] also the tithes were not required in kind; nor were the tithes seized by the parson, but divided between the king, the incumbent, and the church.

This, however, is but a portion of Mr. Malthus's extravagances on this point: having found the Norwegians pupils of his theory, he considered himself obliged to praise their *seeming* [3]. "And I particularly remarked that the sons of housemen, and farmers boys, were fatter, larger, and had better calves to their legs, than boys of the same age and in similar situations in England." Really? Then, possibly, our most wise ministry did fear for the honour of England; and that as they transferred France to the Bourbons, lest the English should love reform, seeing its effects, they starved the full-fed Norwegians into submission to Sweden, lest the English should long for the plethoric board of the inhabitants of the scragg of Scandinavia. Why did not Mr. Malthus take a hint from Ramus, who insisted that Norway was the Ogygia of Homer, and that Ulysses [4] was the god

[1] vol. 1. p. 340. [2] Wollstonecraft's Letters on Norway, p. 111.
[3] vol. 1. p. 316.
[4] Kerguelin's Voyage. Pinkerton, &c. vol. 1. p. 769.

Outin? How differently do men, not devoted to an hypothesis, see the same things and persons! Lamotte describes the Norwegians as small and meagre; Leems[1] speaks of "parts of Norway in which you find paupers sometimes in herds together." Mr. Malthus, on the contrary, beheld an enviable people, eminently enjoying the preventive check, with limbs like a brawny prizer; whose poor[2] "were on the average better off than in England." Yet he admits that this favoured people "are obliged occasionally to mix the inner bark of the pine with their bread." Are the English brought occasionally to a worse state than this? Is there a worse state? Is it not Mr. Malthus's own account of the people about Nootka Sound, whom, when he wishes to excite the most poignant distress, he describes[3] *living very miserably on a paste made of the inner bark of the pine tree and cockles?* There is no greater display of misery in his relations of the savages in Terra del Fuego; or on the islands of Adaman and New Holland, where he exhibits a wretch picking a maggot from a corrupted bone.—Yet Mr. Malthus has not described all the wretchedness of Norway. Von Buch[4], who also mentions the paste of bark, says, that food undergoes a double digestion; that the dung of horses is gathered and given with a mixture of meal, to cows, swine, sheep, &c. who eagerly devour it. This is a landscape with cattle fit to make a back-ground to Sir J. Reynolds's picture of Count Ugolino starving in prison.

[1] On Danish Lapland. Pinkerton, vol. 1. p. 382.

[2] vol. 2. p. 335. [3] vol. 1. p. 74. [4] Travels, p. 535.

Mr. Malthus, who favours Norway and its felicities, does not propose that the priest should have a power of denying marriage to the parties; he proposes only that "the [1] clergyman of each parish, after the publication of banns, should read a short address stating the strong obligations in every man to support his own children, the impropriety and even immorality of marrying without a prospect of being able to do this, the evil, &c." Truly this is not classical, for the priestess of [2] Ceres officiated at the marriage ceremony of the ancients: and does it not occur that this advice would be a little inopportune, if not inauspicious, and savour of Priuli's after-wish—"continual discord and a barren bed attend you both?" Might it not tend, if the preacher were very eloquent, to forbid the banns? nay, to change the passion of the parties from love to its antipathy? And we read that Hegesias [3], though no preacher, spoke so movingly of abstinence, that many died voluntarily of hunger. Another difficulty also occurs—Who is to officiate for this prudential purpose? No married curate, many married rectors, and all clergymen whatever who are disposed to marry or are married, and cannot or do not save sufficient to educate and provide for their families.

Mr. Malthus says [4], "it is clearly the duty of each individual not to marry till he has a prospect of supporting his children." Certainly. But this remark is limited to the laborious part of the community. In consequence he talks infinitely [5] "of the more general

[1] vol. 2. p. 321. [2] Plutarch. Moral. p. 84. [3] Ibid. p. 261.
[4] vol. 2. p. 242. [5] vol. 2. p. 411.

prevalence of prudential habits with respect to marriage among the poor, from which alone any permanent and general improvement of their condition can arise." This accords with the proceedings of the Society for the Suppression of Vice. Are none improvident but those who should preparatory to marriage strike the double average between a day's wages[1] and the quartern loaf? What is wasted in health and property by the rich on mistresses, far exceeds the evils of improvident marriages among the laborious. But suppose not: Do not princes marry and beget children which they cannot provide for? Who is so considerate as William the Third, who when stadtholder and pressed by Temple[2] to marry, said "his fortunes were not in a condition for him to think of a wife?" Do not princes marry? Yet while a beggar's brat is a parish charge, a prince's child oppresses the nation. So of the sons of great commoners, and of lords, and earls, and marquises, and dukes, who save nothing for their younger children, and being idle by right of their cast, are supported by places, and sinecures, and pensions. These are the poor that oppress. Each one of these seizes the provision and wastes the produce of many toiling parsimonious men. These are the poor whose support pauperizes the multitude. They are the tiger's cubs in the dog's litter—they first exhaust and then devour their nurse. Yet Mr. Malthus has nothing to say to these improvident procreators; it is the poor who monopolize all his animadversions: he that has thousands and ten thousands and leaves his brood unprovided, passes unno-

[1] See vol. 2. p. 462. [2] Works, vol. 1. p. 397.

ticed. Of him and his fellows he speaks more gently than Bottom, when he lisps with a *monstrous little voice*; but on the improvidence of a poor man's marriage, he acts the lion's part, and roars that *the duke will say, Let him roar again.*

After protracted marriages as a check to population, I may mention marriages of many women to one man, or polygamy; but having discussed it in a former division of the work, I shall not repeat the topic. Polyandry, or many men married to one woman, I shall defer to a future publication, when I shall detail marriage and its incidents.

Of occasional abstinence of married people I may begin with the nine holy days to Isis [1], during which it was unlawful for man and wife to cohabit. This enjoined reserve was probably a mere priest's trick to profit by an exception, and one of the old Catholic means of helping the exchequer of the temple. The conduct of the Parsees seems however to regard population; they consider one of the *five* sins to have commerce with a woman when she is suckling. This perhaps was intended to prevent repeated pregnancy, or that the mother might contribute her whole strength to the maintenance of her offspring. The ancient Druids it is said cohabited but once a year with their wives. And in Korea [2], sons on a father's death are prohibited from lying with their wives for

[1] Ille petit veniam quoties non abstinet uxor
Concubitu sacris observandisque diebus.
Juvenal, Sat. 6. ver. 535.

[2] Hamel in Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 7. p. 533.

three years, and any children produced during that interval are held illegitimate.

After these partial divorces, total separation follows. The Tapyri, according to Strabo [1], were accustomed to concede their wives in marriage to others, when they had brought them two or three sons; and Aristotle [2] says, the Cretans might divorce themselves if they had too many children.

Different modes have been practised to check generation. The ancient Romans [3] suckled their children till they were three years old. Parke [4] mentions that a negro woman suckles her child for the same period; so do the Morlacchi [5], or longer, for four or five years.

Need I notice abortion? This great abuse was not uncommon I fear in most countries. Among savages it is generally permitted; it was allowed in ancient Rome *visceribus suis vim inferre*. But Plato [6], having fixed the manners of population in his imaginary republic, enforces the practice: so cruel and absurd are the fantastical! Nor can Aristotle [7] be excused. If we believe writers concerning Formosa, women who

[1] lib. 11. t. 2. p. 127. [2] De Repub. lib. 2. c. 10.

[3] Infantes non ante triennium mamma depellebantur.
Gravina, lib. 3. p. 355.

[4] Travels, p. 265.

[5] Travels by l'Abbé Fortis in Dalmatia. Protracted suckling is I believe common in most nations—it is used in Ireland. I have seen in England a child sucking its mother, who was so old as to wear pattens.

[6] De Republica, lib. 5. p. 657. de Legib. lib. 5. p. 847.

[7] De Republica, lib. 7. c. 16.

are pregnant before thirty[1], or according to some before thirty-six[2], habitually cause abortion.

Infanticide or exposure of infants has been tolerated in some countries, and some philosophers have spoken of it with shocking indifference. The Roman[3] father might destroy a monstrous child; but the force of legislation contravened this crime from the origin of the state. Romulus[4] ordered that all the male children and the first born females, θυγατερων τας πρωτογονους, should be preserved; and that no one should expose a child till he was three years old, and then not until he had shown it to five neighbours, and received their approbation. Yet Warburton supposes that Virgil, by placing the weeping[5] shadows of violated babes in the porch of the nether world, intended to discourage infanticide. He might as well have said that Virgil anticipated the satire of Lucian, and employed it in his Epicurean character in contempt of Saturn the *voracious*. Virgil fancied these phantoms merely to complete his group. Exposure of infants was not uncommon in Greece, and a tragedy of the strongest interest depends on that circumstance. It is satisfactory to be able to state, that the Theban[6] law forbad any man on pain of death to expose his child: if however

[1] Ogylby's Japan, p. 51. [2] Ferguson's Authorities.

[3] Pater insignem ad deformitatem puerum cito necato.
Gravina, p. 184

[4] Dion Halicarnassus, lib. 2. c. 15. Hierocles said it was agreeable to nature, that all children should be reared, or the most of them η τα γε πλειστα. Apud Stobæum, serm. 73. p. 448.

[5] Infantium animæ flentes in limine primo.

[6] lib. 2. c. 7.

the parent were in great necessity, he was to bring the child to the magistrate, who was to sell it at a small price, and take security from the purchaser that he would rear the child honestly—the service of the child was considered an equivalent for its education.

It is remarkable that the two general instances of modern infanticide are by those of the higher orders, and that the poor are exempted from the crime. Mr. Malthus admits that the Earreeoie societies *consist exclusively of the higher classes*—their children as soon as produced are frequently suffocated [1]. Mr. Malthus says, that this "is probably often adopted as a fashion rather than a resort of necessity;" which admission is unfavourable to his theory. The other instance is from India. Mr. Moor [2] says, that some tribes in Hindostan destroy their female children from their inability to portion and marry them: that is, according to a certain aristocratical scale, just as the French nobility immersed their daughters in convents. This Hindoo infanticide has been abolished not by law, not by the missionaries, not by the new hierarchy of India, but by Colonel Walker [3]; he suggested to parents the wickedness and inhumanity of the practice, and they reformed.

I have placed among the checks of population infanticide; yet Mr. Hume (and Mr. Malthus [4] subscribes to the doctrine) says that the permission to commit infanticide generally contributes to increase

[1] vol. 1. p. 88, 89. [2] Hindoo Infanticide, p. 25.
[3] Cormack's Account of the Abolition of Female Infanticide.
[4] vol. 1. p. 90.

the population of a country; because by removing the dread of a too numerous family, it promotes marriage; and children being by this means produced, tenderness for the offspring obliges the parents to labour for their support. This is refinement. A people who could tolerate infanticide by law, must be sadly obtuse in their feelings. How far it might operate among the middle orders, I do not say; but with the extremes of society, I fear that in settling the account it would appear that more were lost than gained by the license. The higher orders extinguish their infants in Otaheite, and the superior casts in India follow the same *fashion*, to use an expression of Mr. Malthus. And do we not hear and see how the higher orders treat their infants in civilized Europe, in England? how fashionable mothers, in their meats and drinks and hours, treat both the embryo and the infant? and that sooner than abstain from a life of senseless dissipation, they abandon their children to another's care? nay, a noble and a rich mother places her child in a pauper's bosom. And thus the female of fashion improves on that monster among birds, which substitutes its own egg in the nest of its attendant; for the lady often causes the death of the nurse's infant, and of her own, by the double transfer of children from their mothers:—and this comes of poverty and riches.

Next to infanticide and exposure of children is the custom of employing infants in manufactures[1]; for I

[1] Stat. 42 Geo. III. requires cotton-mills to be kept clean and airy, fixes the clothing of apprentices, that they should be taught

consider not only what is intended to check population, but what actually has that effect. This deserves legislative consideration much more than the misery of climbing-boys, who are comparatively few —and who commonly are hired by their parents; while the others are numerous, and frequently farmed by the directors of parish charities to master manufacturers [1]. To be sure, these often are great men, members of parliament; while perhaps no master-sweep has one vote in county or borough in the empire. Yet we may wonder how the infuriate enemies of negro slavery abroad tolerate this greater slavery at home. What is the reply? In effect, just what the friends of slavery asserted, that encouraging a mart for slaves was a sort of extra philanthropy. For infant task-masters insist that they are not overworked by unremitting labour for thirteen or fourteen hours in the twenty-four. Besides, Dr. Jarrold [2] says, evidence has been adduced that the heated rooms are not unfriendly to life. Then medical evidence can be had at the price of a prescription. I wonder they have not been recommended as a medicated atmosphere for consumptive habits. To be sure, the Doctor admits that the flying particles are injurious to young lungs. Has any of my readers seen an infant gang issuing from a spinning manufactory,

once every day for the four first years reading, writing, and arithmetic.

[1] The magistrates of the West Riding of Yorkshire would not sanction this practice.—Report of Society for bettering the Condition of the Poor, vol. 4.

[2] Dissertation on Man.

immeshed in one web of filth, ghastly and gulping convulsedly the air like fish flung from the water on the land! We are obliged to Dr. Aikin and Dr. Percival[1] for proving to those, who take their opinions from the faculty, the injuriousness of such labour and confinement; and we are still more obliged to Sir S. Romilly, for stating (June 7, 1811) among other atrocities, that at Manchester, two hundred children, who had been bound to a manufacturer, were on his bankruptcy marched to the work-house; that among other evils attending the present disposal of parish apprentices, the crime of murder was not unfrequently committed by masters; and that he knew instances that would fill the house with horror. Sir J. Hippesley Coxe confirmed this statement. To what will this reach? for I perceive that by the parliamentary debates in 1812, a bill was passed to enable the parish of Stroud to bind apprentices out of England[2].

Next to this, if not the same, was the custom of the Thracians[3], who sold their children for export. They thought perhaps, as those mentioned in the Gothic history of Jornandes, "*satius deliberant in-*

[1] Works, vol. 2. p. 356.

[2] The improvements proposed are almost as bad as the practice in the cantons of Zurich. It is said a benevolent regulation has been adopted, that children shall be nine years of age, and not worked more than 14 hours in the day. I have seen a paragraph signifying the great kindness of a master manufacturer in the north of England, because he reduced the time of working from 13 to 12 hours in the day. Dr. Baillie says, that seven years old is the earliest age at which children should be employed in factories.

[3] Herodotus, lib. 5. c. 6.

genuitatem perire quam vitam. Thus the English[1] in the time of Giraldus Cambrensis disposed of their children; and so late as the reign of Henry the Seventh the people of Bristol had a regular market for the same purpose, where the Irish were purchasers. Abominable as this practice appears, the present treatment of infant children under the sentimental name of charity is worse; it is only less terrific than the conduct of the Carthaginians[2], who sacrificed their sons to Saturn, thinking it holy; and of the Jews, who idolized

> —— Moloch, horrid king, besmear'd with blood
> Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears.

The modern idolatry is Mammon, "the least erected spirit that fell from heaven."

Various means have been adopted to destroy or weaken the population in different states in ancient and modern times; as the Cryptia in Sparta, the object of which, however disguised, was simply to destroy the Helotes. The sincere Thucydides relates a dreadful tale to this effect of Spartan policy: a number of Helotes had been offered their freedom; some joyfully presented themselves for manumission: the whole was an artifice to distinguish the more generous spirits: thus they made themselves known, and they were secretly and unaccountably all murdered. Such have been, in some respect, the persecutions in different states from religion or faction. England has been a victim, but Ireland has afforded under various titles a per-

[1] See Anglia Sacra, respecting the collection and sale of boys and girls, t. 1. p. 256. This traffic was practised along both coasts of the British Channel, and along those of the Baltic, &c.

[2] Plato, Minos. Opera, p. 565.

petual sacrifice. Scotland has also exhibited occasions of the same depopulating conduct. When the church of England wished to episcopize this Presbyterian country, the Cryptia was a common engine of the orthodox, and the massacre of Glenco ranks among the worst butcheries on record.

There is another act, not of church or state, but of the Highland proprietors, which I shall notice at some length. Britain, like most other conquered countries, was held by a few great proprietors, who had increased their territories by grants of confiscated estates, and by private war; manufactures were for domestic use, and commerce a paltry barter: rent was paid in kind, which was in part returned in barbarous hospitality in the great hall. Commerce advanced; and strange as it may appear, in these countries it operated to the reduction of agriculture, and the increase of pasturing. Hume says, that in the reign of Edward the Sixth "a great demand arose for wool, both abroad and at home; pasturage was found more profitable than unskilful tillage—whole estates were laid waste by inclosures—the tenants, regarded as a useless burthen, were expelled their habitations[1]." Sir T. More, regarding this situation of England, says in his Utopia, "that a sheep was a more voracious animal than a wolf."

This also was the progress of Scotland in some degree; but the bonds of the feudal state were more equal and more affectionate in Scotland. Each man, except the highest and the lowest, was at once lord and vassal; and it is remarkable, that the authority of the superior increased as the seignory descended; the

[1] vol. 4. p. 328.

vassal had the greater dominion, however light it might appear[1], over the sub-vassal, and loyalty to the king[2] was always secondary and subordinate to allegiance to the chieftain. This state of society, though compounded of many gradations, produced considerable equality and perpetual intercourse; chiefs were equals by right, and their vassals by courtesy[3]. The richer contributed, the poorest were fed, as among the Germans[4]; and the distinction between chiefs and followers specified their intimacy; they sat above and below the salt. In this situation, the interest of Scotland was also affected by the demand for wool; and we find that William the Lion attempted to encourage agriculture, by repressing the multitude of sheep[5]. Latterly sheep have again become the prime concern, nor has one voice been raised in favour of mankind.

To excuse the conduct of proprietors and agents in the Highlands, it is said Scotland was overpeopled by clanship; that a greater population should not be reserved in a country than can be profitably employed; that we are to look to the surplus produce only; that whatever is more productive should be preferred—pasture to agriculture, beasts to mankind:—therefore it

[1] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. 1. p. 454.

[2] Laing's History, vol. 3. p. 47.

[3] Our anti-reformers, having mentioned the word vassal, conclude that few had any right or any power or countenance in elder time; yet du Haillan derives le mot vassal du vieux mot Allemand Geselle, compagnon d'armes.—Bibliothèque de l'Homme, &c. t. 3. p. 68.

[4] Nam epulæ et quamquam incomptæ, largitatem apparâtus pro stipendio cedunt. Tacitus de Morib. Germ. c. 14.

[5] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. 1. p. 791.

is fitting that the sons of those who redeemed the wilderness from nought should be expelled, and that sheep should be substituted for men.

Sir James Steuart imagined this case exactly[1]—I quote it for the benefit of his conclusion—He says, "A Machiavelian stands up (of which there are some in every country) and proposes, in place of multiplying the inhabitants by rendering agriculture more operose, to diminish their number, by throwing a quantity of corn-fields into grass;" adding, "If I propose a reform, it is only to augment the surplus upon which all the state, except the husbandmen, are fed; if the surplus after the reform is greater than at present, the plan is good; although 250 farmers should thereby be forced to starve for hunger,—*though no man is, I believe, capable to reason in so inhuman a style.*" This hypothetical impossibility is not only mooted now, but determined; and hundreds of rare thinkers, profound political œconomists, propose such damnable practices, and many have actually adopted them. They dispossessed families as they would grub up coppice-wood, and they treated villages and their people, as Indians harassed with wild beasts do, in their vengeance, a jungle with tigers. In parts of England, cottages have been prostrated, lest they should afford an asylum for paupers; but in Scotland the people dispossessed were not paupers, they afforded a rent, but they could not afford a raised rent. Concerning this conduct of proprietors in England, but in a much inferior degree, Davenant said[2], "thinking thereby to advance their rent, which proceeds from a narrow mind and short views." Is

[1] Political Œconomy, b. 1. c. 20.

[2] vol. 1. p. 88. Works.

it credible, that in the 18th century, in this missionary age, in this Christian æra, man shall be bartered for a fleece or a carcass of mutton, nay, held cheaper? The Highlander cannot pay an advanced rent; but the sheep which pay no taxes can; and thus, the man's title to his father's land,—whose fathers made it land,—is vitiated. There is nothing more hateful than this conduct; it was unknown to the Spartans[1], who received the ancient rent from the Helotes, nor desired more from them. Nothing is more detestable in the details of modern sordidness and modern tyranny; it surpasses the cruelty of the Russian lord to his boors, and of the slave-masters in the Indies, who dismiss the exhausted negro, for his labour cannot afford a surplus produce. Why, how much worse is it than the intention of the Moguls[2], who, when they had broken into the northern provinces of China, proposed in council to exterminate the inhabitants, and convert the land into pasture! This proposal many Highland proprietors have effected in their own country against their own countrymen; yet the Scotch are called well-educated, *national*, that is, excessively attached to each other; yet the rich have banished their poorer countrymen by families, by hundreds, by districts, and they have been exchanged for herds.—No matter whether wool is sought, or, according to Lord Selkirk[3], flesh-meat is now more relished by townsmen—the act was monstrous. Hindostan

[1] Οι δε ειλωτες αυτοις ειργαζοντο την γην, αποφοραν την ανωθεν εσταμενην—ουτοι μη πλεον επιζητωσιν. Plutarch. Laconica. Moralia, p. 142.

[2] Gibbon, c. 34.

[3] On Emigration, p. 63.

has no such sin to atone. "The ryots or farmers have no property in the ground, but it is not usual to turn any man away so long as he pays the customary rent. *Even in the reign of Tippoo*, such an act would have been looked upon as an astonishing grievance[1]."

Mark the consequences. The Scotch resorted to towns, there to contend for life with men who were inured to city-labour; for, when the proprietors dispossessed them for sheep, they obtained a law to prevent emigration to America. Some, however, were forced abroad poor and vagabond, some to St. John's Island, some to Canada, and to places which, compared with Botany Bay, are as hell to heaven. Yet happier were they in these ruthless regions than their friends who lingered at home, where the fields of Ceres had relapsed to the monster Polyphemus. They struggled, and struggle with misery. The survivors, driven from the country, and unable to exist in the towns, turned their desperate thoughts towards the sea; there they exhibited a picture scarcely less hideous than that presented by Dr. Vincent of the Ichthyophagi[2]: and it is to be remarked, that their misery was at the expense of the state; for a bill was brought into parliament in the 26th of Geo. III. (probably by the means of those who first ejected them, and then stopped their emigration) "for the building of free towns, villages, piers, and fishing. in the Highlands and islands of North Britain." Bounties also were passed, and facilities granted respecting salt-duties, &c. And what

[1] Buchanan in Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 8. p. 699.

[2] View of the Highlands, published in 1784.

has been the result? Why, we are told[1] "the indulgence must be enlarged, more towns must be built," &c.

Such is the national *profit* of this merciless policy; by this a few may have obtained larger rents, but the public is at the expense, while Scotland has not supported its relative proportion; and I am persuaded the absolute strength of the people has declined. Could Scotland now array the numerical force that in 1639[2] was prepared to march into England?

But we shall never want men, perhaps, for the future; yet in 1764 the magistrates of Edinburgh[3], with the Committee of Convention of Royal Boroughs, petitioned his majesty to revoke the license for recruiting in Scotland for the Scotch regiment in the Dutch service, on account of the scarcity of hands. They were wanting, and were found by Mr. Pitt, the greatest of that name. In every year for the last twenty-eight years they were wanted, for we subsidized foreigners; and in 1815, 16,000 Germans were introduced into Britain to preserve the peace of this country. This was done by act of parliament: and in 1816 and 1817, without act of parliament, it is said 30 or 40,000 alien mercenaries are mingled with our native troops. Thus it happens, that while England passes laws for the preservation of game, for saving flax seed, and for the growth of wool; and that to bury in woollens continues to be law, because this *promotes* manufactures and sheep-breeding, there is no saving law for man; a surplus man is a nuisance,

[1] Quarterly Review. [2] Laing's History, vol. 3. p. 162.
[3] Annual Register, 1764, p. 70.

a surplus sheep capital stock. There is a passion or a madness in Britain about breeding beasts, and ox-weighing, and pig-fatting, and sheep-showing and sheep-shearing [1]. The genealogy of a ram or a bull is as elaborate as a pedigree prepared with a view to a claim of peerage. If such subjects be so very interesting to our gentry, it is certain that other questions are sadly neglected. When Rome became imperial, men amused themselves in raising grapes without stones, and the like. Palladius relates the fact. The Cappadocians [2], whether they carried their curiosity into the vineyard and herbary I don't know, had brute heralds; some of their horses were ennobled: and Strabo [3] mentions the extreme sottishness of the same people, who refused liberty, preferring royalty to a republic. Yet the Highland proprietors think they have made a happy exchange: for mere men of Scottish blood they have now sheep [4] from Spain crossed and recrossed, each sheep the sum of a labyrinth of perfections. These shall rival the sacred flock of Apollonius [5]; every Highland lord and his shep-

[1] We approach Egyptian brute worship: yet how differently do we show our love of sheep! We fat and eat them, and bury our corpses in the fleece. The priests of Isis would not in their respect wear woollens nor eat mutton. Plutarch. Moral. p. 262.

[2] Hi mores in genere equorum præstantissimo reperientur. Nam qui infra nobilitatem sunt sati, nulla documenta sui præbuerunt. Polyhistor. lib. 1. c. 47.

[3] lib. 12. v. 2. p. 169.

[4] Cicero was not of this grazing school. Oves quid aliud afferunt, nisi ut earum villis confectis atque contextis homines vestiantur? t. 4. p. 238. Opera.

[5] Herodotus, lib. 9. c. 93.

herd shall be recorded with Hercules and the Argonauts. Would that Ferdinand the Beloved had made them ninth knights of the order of the golden fleece [1]! The Ettrick shepherd and the doggrels, and Dyer's Fleece, and

"Nuceus [2] sweet Hinckleian swain,"

all rival Pan and Arcady. Thus the land was purged, and men were the draff and the disease. Many cottagers were forced into towns, who were again pushed towards the sea, like the ancient inhabitants of this island, when they addressed "the Groans of the Britons" to Rome. Excellent œconomists! rare politicians! as if man were not the first object, and humanity the first virtue, the sovereign boon. Yet to complete the drama according to the modern theatre, this tragedy concludes with a farce, and a Caledonian asylum has been established to educate Highlanders in the midst of London—an act worthy of a crazy personage in one of the crazed modern melodrames, who is represented

"Tending young lambs all in the setting sun."

After the instances of depopulation by which children are forced from their infancy to add to the surplus produce of master manufacturers at the expense of their health and strength and life, and men are banished, come what come may with them, because a thing affords a few shillings more by the poll, while mutton or wool sells at an enhanced price,—we come to those who, so far from adding to the surplus pro-

[1] He conferred that order on our beloved prince.

[2] To this verse in Dyer is appended a note—"Joseph Nutt, an eminent apothecary at Hinckley."

duce that they diminish it. And the instances I shall adduce, I insist, exhibit an improvement on the foregoing practice of lengthening a thread by shortening a life; it is also more simple, and squares admirably with the principles of the *superlucrative* science; for it does not merely bid the obtruder, as at Mr. Malthus's *mighty feast of nature*, begone, but it actually serves up the surplus men at table as surplus produce, and thus converts the feast of nature, while it supports the insatiate argument of Mr. Malthus *of eat a village*, into "the feast of reason and the flow of soul." Thus the Caspii[1] when old were killed; so were the followers of Woden; so were the Heruli[2] when they became old or diseased. Stephanus[3], on the authority of Menander, says there was a law at Ceos, that those who could not live well should die, and that those who had attained sixty years of age should end life by combat. Ælian[4] says, they were forced to die, in order that there might be sufficient subsistence for those who remained; and Strabo[5] agrees with Ælian in the edible part of his observations. Those subject to the Sardoan[6] law killed their parents, as did the Triballians[7] and the Derbices[8]—the last ate them. Polyhistor[9] adds to the summary.

[1] Strabo, lib. 11. t. 2. p. 136.
[2] Procopius de Bello Gothico, lib. 2. c. 14.
[3] De Urbibus, p. 332.
[4] Του διαχειν τοις αλλοις την τροφην. Hist. Varia, lib. 3. c. 37.
[5] Ut reliquis cibaria sufficerent. lib. 10. t. 2. p. 81.
[6] Ælian. Hist. Varia, lib. 4. c. 1.
[7] Aristot. de Topicis, lib. 2. c. ult.
[8] Qui genere proximi sunt, ejus carnes absumunt. Strabo, lib. 11. p. 136.
[9] c. 55.

Nor do we want authorities in modern times: the Battas in the East Indies, Dr. Leyden says[1], kill and eat their parents when infirm. This seems to be the maximum of that consummate science, which disregarding sympathy or affection, wishes to convert life and death, the young and old and middle-aged, to profit, and which resolves the *happiness of countries to the proportion which the population and the food bear to each other*[2]. With such lights in political œconomy as I have here afforded, no one can want plenty while relations are ill or parents old.

Among the means of depopulation, or of preventing the wholesome increase of the people, is superstition. Human sacrifices are an obvious ruin; but beside the destruction of men by the Druids in their gigantic wicker works, and the many hecatombs[3] of human beings by Montezuma's priests, there are other modes of fanatic desolation, and they have been practised in the country of the Druids, and by the successors of Montezuma. It is not merely how many in South America have been prevented from existing by the sacred mismanagement of that vast continent, and they may be calculated by the comparatively increased advance of the population in the United Provinces of North America, but how many have actually perished in the dungeons of the Inquisition; nor do I refer to the numbers burned in Smithfield, but to those

[1] Asiatic Researches, v. 10. article 3.

[2] vol. 1. p. 577. Malthus.

[3] It is said that there were 30,000 killed the year preceding the coming of the Spaniards. Temple's Works, vol. 1. p. 206. This was said probably to discredit them, and was false.

who have been oppressed for their belief, trodden to poverty, forced abroad, baited at home. "How wretched am I!" said Anderson[1], a Catholic; "if I go out of the kingdom, it is said I have with my religion renounced my natural allegiance; and if I stay, by law I forfeit my life." It was in Ireland, however, that a Protestant government exhibited the full extent of sectarian malignity; and ministry continues it as far as weakness and malice and the episcopacy can succeed. The pure destruction of ghostliness is an endless tale; every great sect claims its murderers and martyrs: the devotees of Juggernaut; the loving widows of Hindoo husbands, who rival the Thracian women[2]; the convulsionaries in France; the assassins in Denmark for righteousness sake, which has in some measure been revived by Peschel in Germany. There is no respite or end to the destructive horrors of superstition. At present, at Tripoli[3], it is said that one third of the people buried by the pious precipitation of their friends are alive.

All partial and iniquitous governments check population. A monopoly, a bounty, favouring towns or country, or manufactures or commerce, every operation which prevents or even diverts the inherent disposition to improve, increase, or accumulate, affects population, either in their number or their efficiency. I speak, however, of the more obvious iniquities of government, as the penal laws by which, in the time of Sir Thomas More, men were hanged by scores,

[1] State Trials, vol. 2. p. 1082.

[2] lib. 1. c. 16.

[3] Narrative of Ten Years Residence at Tripoli.

and thousands were annually executed. This swift destruction was diminished; and in 1649[1] an act was passed to transplant felons reprieved to the Summer Islands, and to other English plantations in America; but as these outlets were insufficient or incommodious, in 1651[2] sixty persons convicted of petty larcenies were shipped for Ireland. Thus England, such is the vicissitude of things, which was a receiving place for felons when a province of Rome[3], in its turn vomited forth the wretches of its domestic misrule on its dependencies.

Bad government operates by ten thousand modes of destruction, and it is at once tortuous and direct. When Polycrates[4], *tyrant* of Samos, one of Mr. Mitford's slandered good and great princes, wished to crush the high-minded Samians, he surreptitiously sought Cambyses that he would solicit his assistance. The Samians were armed, and sent to serve the great king, on condition that Polycrates should hear no more of them. In like manner Periander sent three hundred youths of the first families of Corcyra, to be emasculated at Sardis; and it was proposed by the Irish house of commons, less than a century ago, that the Irish priests should be castrated, for no matter the amount of the villany perpetrated in any age or nation, Ireland can afford a parallel enormity.

Thus tyranny disperses some, destroys others, excites general discontent, exasperates all the passions, causes seditions, insurrection, civil wars, which effect changes not less than the flaming sword of Milton, when

[1] Whitelock's Mem. p. 400. [2] Ibid. p. 465.

[3] Marcellinus, lib. 21. c. 1. [4] Herodotus, lib. 3. c. 44.

Eden's temperate clime felt the hot air of the Libyan desert. Such was the war between the people and Charles the First, which had so miserable a progress and so sad an issue; and who suffered himself, "by all the laws that he had left the people[1]." But the great destruction and confusion were in Ireland: there the inhabitants were swept away by craft and force and falsehood; the world seemed too narrow for their dispersion. "Many Irish transplanted by agreement[2]." "Articles were agreed to transplant the Munster tories to Flanders[3]." Such was the desolation in Ireland, that it became a void, a receptacle for all comers. Scotch[4] and others entered on all sides, as air into a vacuum. Sir W. Temple[5] could not account for the depopulation in England for the last fifty years, except "by the great numbers of English resorting into Ireland upon the desolations arrived there."

[1] This man obtained the crown of martyrdom by the union of church and state. But it was shocking to punish him, as it is shocking that there is no law to punish the greatest criminals. It is said he was willing to grant every thing, &c. But what security was there for his veracity? Hume speaks of Charles's *frequent evasive messages during the session*, vol. 6. p. 255. Charles revived monopolies, *so solemnly abolished*, p. 374. Charles had impeached Lord Kimbolton and the five members of treason, p. 465. On which Hume says, "How could such an attempt be considered as treason after the act of oblivion which had passed?" p. 468. The historian adds other instances. The loyal should inform us how often a king may lie, and yet be believed. A citizen loses all credit by a single lie, but kings have a large prerogative in this respect; and the magnanimous allies, by common consent, have increased it.

[2] Whitelock's Memorials, p. 528.

[3] Ibid. p. 565.

[4] Laing's History, vol. 4. p. 37.

[5] On Popular Discontents. Works, vol. 1. p. 267.

As civil wars proceed from bad government, foreign wars are frequently the sequel of both. The contest of England with her American colonies excited warfare in Europe and in the East. The civil war in France committed the whole world in arms during twenty-five years of infinite destruction. Yet the ruin in the field of battle, the ten and twenty thousands and thirty thousands killed, of which some have read with such joy,—and for which Christian states have alternately sung praises to God, as if they adored homicidal Mars,—is the smallest portion of the mortality occasioned by glorious war. Indeed, some think with the *now* ultra-royalist Chateaubriand,—when this shifting flatterer told Bonaparte, amidst his havoc of mankind, that he only expended the superfluous population by his armies,—that war is a blood-letting of the body politic, sick with plethora even to apoplexy. Certainly war is a mighty medicine for a great disease[1]. The massacre in battle is decisive, and readily counted; but the loss of the fugitives, the loss of prisoners, (of which the three hundred horsemen annually devoted to Swetovid[2], a pagan god of Russia,) is but typical of the victims which Christian sovereigns of the same country offer to the God of peace. Mark, that the massacre on the assault of towns,—though every inhabitant perished, as when the populous city of Urgentz[3] was captured by Zengis Kan,—that the massacre in the heat of battle and in the pursuit, is comparatively unimportant to the destruc-

[1] Bellis atque seditionibus plures deleti sunt quam omni reliqua calamitate. Cicero, t. 4. p. 476. [2] Tooke's Russia, vol. 1. p. 118.
[3] Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 9. p. 327.

tive consequences of war. "La faim moissonna encore plus de Français que le fer pendant la guerre de la succession d'Espagne[1]." This is not peculiar:—a soldier's life embraces every possible calamity, and every circumstance of perdition[2]. Lacy[3] and Munich lost half their armies in their campaigns with the Tartars, without meeting an enemy in the field. We have had some experience of this swift depopulation in the isle of Walcheren and in the West Indies. Mr. Stephen[4] proved by authentic returns, that from 1796 to 1802 the English lost by sickness in the Windward Islands, exclusive of St. Domingo and Jamaica, 17,173 men out of 19,670. Suppose, however, they were not destroyed; suppose them the triumphant survivors. Sir J. M'Gregor states, that from December 1811 to June 1814, (in two years and a half,) there were treated in the British hospitals of the Peninsula, 346,108 diseases and wounds. Consider these, ye shallow boasters! for these form the obverse of the medal of Victory. I have not spoken of the pestilences which war has a thousand times originated, from the siege of Troy to the battle of Leipsic. Wars cause waste of substance[5], destruction of capital, habits of idleness, violence, and a general derangement of society, in all its comfortable, consolatory, and ge-

[1] Say, t. 2. p. 351. [2] Milites incuria, fame, morbo, vastitate consumpti. Cicero, t. 2. p. 507. [3] Annual Register, 1769, p. 3.

[4] Steele and Dickson, &c. p. 11.

[5] Of two contracts by the English commissariat in Egypt in 1812: one for corn, which was spoiled and useless; the other for horses, which were destroyed in Spain lest they should be possessed by the French.

nerous relations. Conquests, the object of war, enforce evil and continue it. By conquest, perpetual enmity is entailed in some cases. M. Peron[1] mentions four descriptions of people in Timor,—the aborigines in the interior armed with the bow and the club; the Malays nearer the shore; and the Portuguese and their conquerors,—who are all hostile to each other. Such is the situation of many people in Africa and along the Mediterranean. In Barbary there are three races. The Moors along the shore, who repelled the Arabs, who now inhabit the plains, and who had driven back the Berebbers, who now inhabit the mountains, and are shepherds or hunters. The Berebbers are the aborigines; they extend far into the interior, even above the Cataracts, and are probably, though occasionally recruited, descendants of the Bucoli, who harassed the agriculturists of Egypt from the remotest reach of history. This may seem extravagant;—yet what was the state of Ireland, or what is the state of Ireland after six centuries? The law of William the Conqueror in England is now law in Ireland: the curfew is revived; and not long since, the inhabitants of the plains and of the mountains, of the towns and the deserts, were as distinctive as the Moors and Berebbers, the Malays and Portuguese; and this in a great measure continues, in consequence of the sacred union of church and state, under the superlative characters of Protestants and Catholics.

These depopulating consequences of war and conquest are incalculably heightened by the innovation of standing armies. Soldiers are not merely so many

[1] Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 11. p. 804.

deducted from the common stock of industry: they must be fed and clothed by others; and a soldier consumes twice as much or more than a labourer: thus each soldier, in effect, deducts three or more from the profitable industry of the state.

No country exhibits the evil of war in this respect more strongly than England. Every island and promontory which she gains, though purposely to insure her strength, constantly adds to her army, to her expense, till she has raised a debt, the interest of which equals the present rental of her land. All these,—war, conquest, standing armies,—directly and incidentally waste the substance, destroy the people, and enslave them. And in my mind slavery contains all sorts of depopulation: though so perversely disposed are the apprehensions of some men, that slavery has been considered a means of extreme populousness and extraordinary profits.

By slavery, it is said, those who would have been slain are saved; and no doubt murder has sometimes been respited by avarice: but to insinuate that all who are enslaved would have been slain, were men not marketable, is most false. Slave-making is a trade in the first instance by the captors. Whatever was the project of Julius Cæsar in disturbing the British[1], the Romans soon learned that they could obtain nothing from that island, if Cicero be an authority[2], except

[1] Raleigh's observations may afford a hint. "Enterprises done in countries remote are more praiseable: for the less they are known, the greater the glory to achieve them." Cabinet Council, p. 142.

[2] "Illud jam cognitum est neque argenti scriptum esse ullum

ignorant slaves. And it is certain when the Romans ceased to conquer they ceased to import slaves: as we learn that the number of slaves brought to Constantinople[1] depended on the success of the wars of the Tartars. Slave-making has been a trade, and the ransom of a prisoner and the price of a slave were equally ascertained in various nations. It appears from Leo Africanus[2], that his majesty of Borno invaded the neighbouring territories every year to obtain slaves, which he exchanged for the wants of his royal household. Nations seem not merely to traffic in slaves procured by war; but also to attempt, by a concatenated depredation, to preserve a balance of this trade in their favour. The Shangalla[3] make inroads on the Agows, seize their children, and sell them to the Mahometans at Guba. Thus they endeavour to indemnify themselves for their losses in the same way by the Abyssinians[4]. This hunting begins with the dry season; and every governor from Baharnagash to the Nile is obliged to pay a certain tribute of slaves. It is remarkable that many thousand Christian slaves are sent from Africa to Asia by Christians[5], and that these slaves lose at once their liberty and their religion. These observations come from Bruce, who is an unexceptionable testimony, as he favours the slave-trade,

in illa insula, neque ullam spem prædæ, nisi ex mancipiis, ex quibus nullos puto te litteris aut musicis eruditos expectare. Cicero ad Atticum, t. 3. p. 246.

[1] Ricaut, b. 1. c. 18.

[2] lib. 7.

[3] Bruce's Travels, vol. 2. p. 40.

[4] Ibid. vol. 3. p. 156.

[5] vol. 2. p. 29. There is an account of a number sent by the king of Ethiopia to Aurengzebe, and some of them fit to be made eunuchs of. Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 8. p. 107.

and condemns the attempt to abolish it as *relaxation and effeminacy*[1], and tending to the *decay of trade and navigation*. Slave-making is not then, generally, a redemption from death; it is a mere trade. Thus the people of Madagascar fit out expeditions against the tranquil inhabitants of the Comoro Islands, for the purpose of seizing and carrying them off, that they may sell them. The slave-trade, so far from relieving humanity, has added to the sufferings of many nations. Mr. Meredith, in his "Account of the Gold Coast[2]," speaking of the Fantees, says, "their punishments are fines and slavery, which amount to nearly the same thing; for, if the guilty person cannot pay the fine, he is by law adjudged to be a slave." And it is ascertained that when the slave-trade flourished without check or molestation, the most trifling offence was punished in the slave country by loss of liberty. This trade in Africa,—the European slave-trade in Africa,—was carried on along 3000 miles of coast[3], from the river Senegal to Cape Negro:—it has been narrowed; it has been reduced; and some tribes which seized men in their incursions, are now satisfied with pillaging cattle[4]. But the limitation of the slave-market has augmented the hardships of those districts which continue within the sphere of its operation. Salt[5] speaks of slaves marched nine hundred miles to be sold. And it has been remarked, that though the mouths of the Senegal and Gambia are freed from witnessing this traffic, or rather

[1] Bruce's Travels, vol. 2. p. 30. [2] p. 312.
[3] Clarkson on the Slave Trade, vol. 1. p. 22.
[4] Fifth Report of the African Institution.
[5] Travels in Abyssinia, p. 32.

this murder and robbery, the wretches are now driven more expeditiously to the Spanish and Portuguese slave-dealers at Benin. We are told that the slave-trade does not depopulate; that "the supply is always equal to the demand:" yet both banks of Rio Grande were unpeopled by the slave-trade. If the slave-trade should not depopulate, nothing is destructive of the race of man.—"The supply equal to the demand!!" Do animals hunted in the wilderness increase as they are destroyed? Why the hunters of these beasts, the fur traders in America, by vitiating the simple lives of the savages[1], and supplying them with spirits, have impaired their slender population; and thus populous villages have dwindled into a few wandering families.—I proceed to another view of this hideous subject.

Wallace imagined that slaves anciently were more available than inferior free-men in after-times toward the increase of the people; and Sir James Steuart[2] to the same purpose esteemed *slavery, or a violent method of making mankind labour, as the third principle of multiplication.* And again he says[3], "From these principles it appears, that slavery in former times had the same effect in peopling the world, that trade and industry have now. Men were then forced to labour, because they were slaves to others; men are now forced to labour, because they are slaves to their own wants." Some French writers seem to carry

[1] The Europeans have corrupted the Africans. Meredith says that those of the interior, in consequence, are much less vicious than those on the coast.

[2] vol. 1. p. 90.

[3] vol. 1. p. 40.

this error a gradation further. Mons. Chateaubriand considers that slavery enabled the Greeks and Romans to succeed in works of art; as did Mons. Thomas [1]: "Il falloit nécessairement à un pareil peuple la liberté, le loisir, l'aisance; il falloit des esclaves chargés de travailler pour eux et de suppléer à tous les soins de la vie." In this rhetorician's mind slavery is as necessary to the cultivation of the arts, as in a West Indian planter's apprehension Negroland is to the growth of sugar-canes.

I am as yet to learn the progress of the Spartans in the arts, who had more slaves than any other Grecian people. As to the liberty, leisure, and ease of the Romans,—when did these concur? A few observations on this people will, beside other instruction, evince the futility of the assertion.

At Rome every year there was a levy of citizens, and every citizen could only attain civil appointments by a ten years warfare [2]. The life of a Roman was war—his object plunder. The state grew and increased by both. Five hundred years Rome employed in conquering Italy: in two hundred [3] she mastered the world. During this whole period the Romans, those humanizers of mankind, who, according to many, prepared by supreme appointment the world for the reception of Christianity, carried on unabated war; for the temple of Janus was only shut [4] three

[1] Eloges, t. 2. p. 98.

[2] Polybius, lib. 6. p. 466.

[3] Florus, lib. 2. c. 1. Polybius says in 53 years. Preface.

[4] A. Victor, de Viris illustribus, p. 100. V. Paterculus, lib. 2. c. 38.

times for short periods. Indeed, the last of these seems to have been an order unexecuted; for Dion Cassius[1] says the temple of Janus was decreed to be shut, but the passage of the frozen Ister prevented it. Florus says it was shut by Augustus, and he laments the event—"pronum in omnia mala[2];" so intimately were war and fortune fixed in a Roman's mind.

The kings and patricians of Rome,—for the people were nothing, or worse than nothing,—surpassed our modern politicians in their progress to universal empire. Romulus[3] took Cameria; he transplanted half its inhabitants to Rome, and sent double their number of Romans to Cameria. The Ausoni[4] were exterminated; Capua and Carthage rased; of Corinth scarcely a vestige remained,—and this Cicero[5] justified in his speech on the Agrarian law. On the defeat of Perseus[6] 150,000 slaves were made in Epirus, and seventy cities sacked. These are specimens of their steps to empire, for the Roman government proceeded by repeating similar deeds.

What was the consequence? Incessant rebellions and insurrections abroad; and at home in continual jeopardy from the Gauls, or Carthaginians, or Cimbri, &c. of being themselves extinguished, either by foreign nations or by the Italian states, as in the

[1] lib. 54. c. 36. He says in a preceding book, however, that Augustus shut it. lib. 53. c. 26.

[2] Last page of his History.

[3] Plutarch. in Romulo.

[4] Deletaque Ausonum gens. Livius, lib. 9. c. 25.

[5] t. 2. p. 304.

[6] Plutarch. in P. Æmilio.

Social war, or by their slaves [1]. The Servile war, ended by Pompey, Cicero [2] reserves for the consummation of Pompey's military glory.

The world mistakes the Roman state: few governments have been weaker. The Romans were distressed by pirates [3], and scarcely succeeded against them. Balba [4] with six hundred robbers plundered Italy unchecked for six years. This man, on being taken, answered the prefect Papinian, who asked him by what right he exercised robbery? "By that which made you prefect." And Variathus [5], a leader of a band of outlaws, made war on the Romans and frequently worsted them.

What did the Roman *people* gain by all these wars? Misery, loss of power, poverty, annihilation:—the wars immersed them in debt and prison. Before the banishment of Tarquin, and just when they feared his return, the patricians condescended [6] to conciliate the people; but afterwards they treated them servilely,

[1] Florus says, Quid autem bella servilia? Unde nobis, nisi ex abundantia familiarum. lib. 3. c. 12.

[2] Pro Lege Manilia, t. 2. p. 240. Their wars with the gladiators was a servile war also: that in which Spartacus commanded against them was most dangerous—Quorum numerus in tantum adolevit, ut quia ultimo dimicavere acie XL millia hominum se Romano exercitui opposuerunt. V. Paterculus, lib. 2. c. 30.

[3] This was another achievement of Pompey. Xiphilin. p. 4.

[4] Dion Cassius, lib. 76. c. 10.

[5] A. Victor, de Viris illustribus, p. 90. V. Paterculus says, Ita varia fortuna gestum est, ut sæpius Romanorum gereretur adversus. lib. 2. c. 1.

[6] Æquo et modesto jure:—But afterward, servili imperio patres plebem exercere, de vita atque tergo regio more consulere, &c. Salust. Fragm. 1. Historia.

according to the royal practice. The patricians possessed all the territory, all the wealth of the state; while the people were so abject, that as common labourers they were neglected for slaves. Nay, a law was passed by the interest of Licinius Stolo [1], ordering that every proprietor should employ a certain number of free-men on his land. This of course was nugatory. Hence the remnant of the Roman people was supported by poor laws and occasional gratuities. They had been declining to this situation from a very early period. It is true, execration is pronounced in the Twelve Tables [2] on the fraudulent patron; and Virgil [3] places such among the climax of sinners. But patronage was in truth a monopoly of power, and clients [4] the items in the account. Patricians might boast the connexion, just as Cicero [5] called the dominion of Rome its patronage of the world; and as Augustus, who sacrificed three hundred human victims to Divus Julius [6], exhibited plays to Honour and Virtue [7].

We have seen the operation of slaves on the Roman *people:* their effects on the patricians were equally ruinous. Having subjected the world and ex-

[1] Appian. de Bello Civili, p. 354.

[2] Patronus si clienti fraudem faxit, sacer esto.

[3] ——————Fraus innexa clienti.

[4] ——————Illa turba clientium
Sit major. Horatius, ode 1. lib. 3.

[5] Nos magis patronatum orbis terrarum suscepimus quam imperium.

[6] Trecentos ex deditiis electos ex utriusque ordinis ad aram Divo Julio extructam, idibus Martiis hostiorum more mactatos. Suetonius, lib. 2. c. 15.

[7] Της Τιμης και Αρετης. Dion Cassius, lib. 54. c. 18.

tinguished their native citizens, and made Italy a prison-house, they themselves sunk under the most deplorable despotism, morally and physically, that ever afflicted any nation that had ever advanced towards civilization. The whole order perished repeatedly. Yet we are told that anciently slavery multiplied mankind;—though slave-making occasioned immediate death or swift destruction; though slavery converted the free hands into armed task-masters to enforce labour and suppress insurrections. In the time of calamity the slave fled [1] to the enemy; or retaliated [2] privately, as did the Roman slaves on the sack of Rome by Alaric, the stripes and ignominy of their masters; or publicly, as in the servile wars in Scythia [3]; at Tyre [4], where they massacred their masters; in Sicily [5], where their slaughter was so excessive, that it was said locusts arose from the blood of the unburied, and consumed the corn of the island [6]. In short, of such importance and variety were these starts of vengeance and efforts for redemption, that Cæcilius [7] the rhetorician composed a book on the servile wars, Περι των δουλικων πολεμων.

I know no difference betwixt ancient and modern slavery, nor any distinction except the greater or less slavery; and this has no regard to times past or present, or to this or that religion; for the people of every religion, ancient and modern, have had slaves, and none more than the Christians, and the Christians of

[1] Thucydides, lib. 8. p. 581,
[2] Gibbon, c. 31. v. 3. p. 203.
[3] Justin. lib. 2. c. 5.
[4] Ibid. lib. 18. c. 5.
[5] Florus, lib. 3. c. 19.
[6] Plutarch. Moralia, p. 522.
[7] Athenæus, lib. 6. p. 272.

all denominations. It is true, some nations have regulated the state of slavery. The Greeks, when they loved liberty, said Philostratus[1], would not sell a slave beyond the boundaries of Greece. The Jews also, though they admitted the servitude of their men, prohibited that of their women: "If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do[2]:" which is followed by the Turks:— no woman of Turkish birth can be a slave[3]. Portions of the world in all ages have expressed a kindness for the most unfortunate. Julius Pollux speaks of places of refuge for slaves[4]. It appears also that Dupolis[5] in Libya conferred liberty on whatever slave entered it. But signal and distinguished among the ancients were the Locrians and Phoceans[6], who employed no slaves; as were the Indians, who, if Arrian[7], Strabo[8], Diodorus Siculus[9], report truly, were equally liberal and enlightened.

It is true, the Romans were not the worst masters; and the Athenians were distinguished for liberality to their abject inmates. An Athenian slave

[1] Apol. Tyan. Vita, lib. 8. c. 7. Callicratidas did more. When the allies proposed the sale of the Methymnæans, he said "that where he commanded no Grecian should be reduced to slavery." Xenophon. Historia Græca, lib. 1. p. 444.

[2] Exodus, chap. 21.

[3] Dallaway's Constantinople, p. 33.

[4] Και ιεροις οροις, εφ' οσον τοις οικεταις ασφαλεια, sacros terminos, in quibus servis securitas præbetur. Onomasticon, lib. 1. c. 1. 10.

[5] Stephanus de Urbibus, p. 243.

[6] Athenæus, lib. 6. p. 264.

[7] In Indice, c. 10.

[8] lib. 15. t. 2. p. 452.

[9] lib. 2.

might on ill usage by his master demand[1] a sale (πρασιν αιτειν). A slave might also be redeemed[2] by paying his master his price. The Athenian slave had some yearly wages, by which in time he might purchase his freedom. Yet still I have no doubt but slavery in this mitigated form was pernicious; freemen would have been more productive labourers, and therefore the whole population of Attica would have been multiplied had all been free. Consider the price which Nicias received for his slaves per day; he farmed them to his overseer. Those who were employed in the mines only procured him a current profit of one obolus a day[3]. If ever slavery could be profitable, it must have been at Athens, a most commercial state, where slaves were bought for two minæ[4]. Yet at Rome, in Cato the Censor's time[5], the price of a slave was seven times more. An obolus was inconsiderable in any circumstances for a man's day's labour: but how small must have been the returns from slaves' work, when Demosthenes, who inherited fifty-two from his father (and some of them artisans), was not distinguished for opulence!—Indeed, from his remarks on Midias, he was the reverse. Nor can his situation be attributed entirely to the fraud of his guardians. Does any one

[1] Plutarch. Moral. p. 100. The same is said to be the case in the Caraccas:—the slave may be bought by law if ill used for 300 dollars.

[2] Petit, L. Att. p. 179. [3] Xenophon de Rat. Redita.

[4] Demosthenes adv. Spudiam, p. 1018.

[5] Fifteen hundred drachmæ seems the common price at that time. Plutarch. in Catonem C.

believe that a free labourer at Athens would not, if he had the means of employment, raise more than an obolus a day beyond the cost of his maintenance?

Yet does Mons. Say, a friend of liberty and a judicious œconomist, actually insist on the greater productiveness of the labour of slaves—an absurdity which I thought never could be revived by any generous and intelligent man. He says, "I have no doubt that the labour of the slave yields a greater surplus of production over consumption than the labour of free-men [1]." And he would prove this, because the slave is urged to the utmost, goaded by the avarice of his master to the extent of his faculties. In the second edition [2] of his Essay, though not quite so decisive, he still insists that the labour of slaves is the best for the planters; and he thinks it conclusive on this point: "l'opiniâtreté seule qu'ils mettent à defendre l'esclavage, prouve qu'il est une économie pour eux." If this reasoning be just, no prince would reduce his subjects to tyranny: for I hope it will not be contested that slaves are less available as a nation than free-men. If this reasoning were just, all despots would introduce representative governments. Yet now despots, sooner than acquit their promises to this effect, endanger their own pre-eminence. All sorts of government act with similar desperation. The Genoese so treated Corsica. It was truly said of them on that occasion,—that so they were sovereigns, they cared not if they governed rocks

[1] I quote this from Ganilh, p. 147, (Eng. version,) not having seen the first edition of Say's work, in 1803.

[2] t. 1. p. 286.

without people. In the same spirit the English made war in America, as now does Ferdinand the Beloved. Nor do I remember an aristocracy or a prince who could divest themselves of an expensive dependency, or reinstate any people in their rights, since the time of Nero[1], who having depopulated Greece left it free.

I know there are men who speak in the highest terms of the care taken of slaves in the West Indies, and of their happiness. Brian Edwards[2] tells a tale of a slave who said, "Since me come to white man's country, me lub life too much:"—that the state of a negro slave was a felicity dangerous to salvation. From such statements we should suppose that flogging was a slander of innovators and reformers; or that if indeed castigation ever was used, it was performed in the philosophical spirit of Plato[3], who desired Xenocrates to beat his slave, for he was angry and dared not; and moreover that the colonial legislatures and colonial judges were guardian angels. What is the fact? The health of the slave is disregarded, to the injury of the master's returns:—murders are committed. Who has not heard of Huggins and Hodges? The latter, a planter of Tortola, was of his majesty's council. It was sworn that the severity of his punishments killed sixty negroes. What signify laws in such circumstances? At Barbadoes a law was passed, that a slave should not receive more

[1] Πασαν μεν Ἑλλαδα ελεηλατησε καιπερ ελευθεραν αφεις.
Dion Cassius, lib. 63. c. 11.

[2] History, p. 70.

[3] Diogenes Laertius, p. 209.

than 39 lashes at *one time*[1]: and the consequence was, on the 39 lashes being given, there was a halt for a short time, when the lashing recommenced. Suppose we had no damning facts of cruelty to slaves; what must have been committed in these outlying countries, where for many years our soldiers were repeatedly flogged, contrary to the acknowledged law of Great Britain? The judges of the West Indies were like their fellows, and power directed the judicatures. Dr. Pinkard states the opinion of a judge, published by himself and subscribed by his name in a colonial gazette, "That the authority of the master over his negroes is not to be encumbered with official formalities." That judge among us who would be executioner also, could not say more. Such being the conduct of the constituted authorities and the masters, the same tyranny descends of course to factors and assistants. It appears that the white servants of Barbadoes, and consequently of other colonies, "*understood*[2]" that the power of the masters over the negroes belonged to them; and they frequently killed them with impunity.

Mons. Say is mistaken when he supposes that men will follow their interest sordidly considered, when they possess absolute dominion; for this creates a hundred wayward passions. Mons. Say has however the opinion of William Pitt, as expressed to Mr. Clarkson, in favour of his belief. But how potently soever selfishness operates, it is perpetually

[1] Clarkson on the Slave Trade, vol. 2. p. 248.
[2] Steele and Dickson, p. 146.

disturbed by the blind will of tyranny. Inchiquin the Jesuit said truly, "Man will not labour, where he can substitute slaves: and wherever man does not labour, he will abuse his time and his faculties." The whites will not labour the land, but they will scourge the labourer, scourge him. Not long since an advertisement appeared in a Jamaica newspaper[1], in which 134 runaways, who went off together, were advertised: it stated that 48 of them were branded, one had his ears cropt, and another *both nose and ears cut off*. It is the slave-master's interest to treat slaves with humanity: yet Mr. Collins, who did so, and who realized 70,000*l*. by hiring slaves, is mentioned as an extraordinary character, who has had few imitators. The slave-master disregards man, himself, his property;—slavery is a common destruction. A law was passed, that for every ten negroes in Jamaica there should be one acre of ground cultivated for provisions; yet it appears that the provision grounds were not a fourth of the quantity required by law[2].

[1] Steele and Dickson, p. 435.

[2] Sir W. Young, p. 14, states the produce of Jamaica in 1799:

Coffee plantation.....15,343 acres
Sugar ditto..... 105,232
Provision grounds.....7771

The number of the slaves in this year I do n't recollect; but in

1810 they were 313,683
1811 326,830
1812 319,912
1813 317,424
1814 315,385
1815 313,814

In Botany Bay in 1810 there were 10,454 persons; they had then 21,000 acres in cultivation: and in 1800, when the popula-

By this neglect they submitted to the mercy of the Americans for their existence. Such is the misrule, the outrage, the self-destructiveness of absolute power.

The reasoning of Mons. Say is wrong generally, and in its specific application. It affords no colour for believing that slave servants are profitable, because they are not relinquished for free hands; for the pleasure of dominion to mischievous men is above all price. It appears to me that it was in consequence of slavery, and, of course, indifference to human toil, that so few improvements were made in mechanism formerly, compared to those in after-times [1]. Consider their mode of lifting masses of stone in different countries;—a mound was raised, one surface being an inclined plane, up which the stones were rolled. Thus, to erect an edifice they accumulated a mountain. Strabo [2] speaks of one hundred and fifty captives in Egypt employed in carrying water from the river. It is the essence of slavery to sink the man beneath the beast; for the master rates his own dignity by the other's depression. I wonder how Mons. Say could so transgress: for facts are as hostile to his assumption, as is the philosophy of man. In the West Indies,

tion was 6,000, they had nearly as much in cultivation for food as in Jamaica (as above stated) for its hundred thousands.

[1] I am ashamed to support this remark by a statement of Sutcliff in his Travels in North America. "It is pleasant to observe on this outlet (of the lake Skaneatetes) a number of mills sufficient to do the work of some thousands of Virginian slaves. It is greatly to be lamented that the absurd policy of the Southern states has placed these poor creatures as a barrier against every improvement in mechanics, &c."

[2] lib. 17. vol. 2. p. 613.

approaching the slave to a freeman (that is, paying slaves for their labour[1]) serves their owners. And the same authors[2] mention, that a planter's slaves, *when paid*, did all his holing for less than a fourth part of the three pounds currency per acre which it had cost him *before they were paid*. As an approach to liberty cheapens labour, an approach to slavery enhances it; as it has been ascertained that the labour of colliers in Scotland suffering a moderate vassalage, was doubly more expensive than that of free hands in the same country. To talk of the cheapness of slave's labour at this time is a monstrous error. Those who labour by slaves, obtain produce always enhanced[3]. Mons. le Poivre long since spoke largely and wisely on the absurdity of cultivating cheaply sugar by slaves; and he exemplified his reasoning by the culture of sugar in Cochin China by free hands, concluding, "The earth which multiplies productions with profusion under the hands of freemen, shrinks into barrenness under the sweat of a slave." To urge in any way the advantage of slave labour, is to revive the absurdity of Columella[4], who could not see the evil, though he witnessed the decline of agriculture in Italy, and lamented it.

While discussing the subject of population as af-

[1] Steele and Dickson, p. 13. [2] Ibid. p. 447.

[3] Mr. Greenleaf affords another exemplification of the expense of slave labour. He supposes the average number of inhabitants in New England before the population exceeds, to be about forty to a square mile; though, he adds, the *slave-holding* states cannot retain their population so long. Statistical View, &c.

[4] De Re Rustica, lib. 1. c. 7.

fected by slavery, an extraordinary assertion of Mr. Malthus occurs to me. He says[1], "It appears from a very general survey of different countries, that under every form of government, however unjust or tyrannical; in every climate of the world, however unfavourable to health; it has been found, that population, with the sole exception above alluded to, (the West Indies,) has been able to keep itself up to the level of the means of subsistence." Without inquiring into the accuracy or confusion of his *up-and-down level*, he has expressly contradicted this dogma[2]. For instance: of Otaheite, he says, "the population is at present repressed considerably below the average means of subsistence[3]." Does he not admit that the same is apparent in Africa, where the herds of cattle are vast, and the soil of wonderful fertility[4]? Does he not state, that the produce of Russia is above its consumption[5]? And of Southern Siberia, does he not say, that population does not increase in proportion to the *nature* of the soil[6]? So much for consistency. But what could so stupefy the mind or the eye of Mr. Malthus, as to insist that, no matter how mortal the disease or how oppressive the tyranny, men would support their numbers provided they were fed? This is the purport of his doctrine. Are there not countries and districts

[1] vol. 2. p. 432.

[2] He says, "Population must always be kept down to the level of the means of subsistence." Preface, p. 7. This up-and-down was the wonder of the Euripus. Ὥσπερ Ευριπος ανω και κατω φερεται. Aristides, Orat. t. 2. p. 380. Does he mean, that men starved will die?

[3] vol. 1. p. 97.

[4] vol. 1. p. 170.

[5] vol. 1. p. 368.

[6] vol. 1. p. 199.

once populous now desert? If, then, we subscribe to Mr. Malthus's statement, the food ceased before the people declined. This is astonishing. Then, whether a battle or a pestilence sweeps off the multitude, subsistence had diminished somehow by anticipation.

But suppose we allow Mr. Malthus to mend his expression, or explain his meaning by a large allowance. Suppose we should insert *permanently*, or any word that might extend it beyond a sudden casualty. Have not many populous nations declined in numbers? and why must we disbelieve that their provisions, and, what is the same, the productive land, declined subsequently to the depopulation? Was not the population of Spain reduced by the banishment of Moors and Jews? Were they banished because the Spaniards were famished? No. Nor did the Catholic Spaniards replenish the seats of the banished Hebrews and Mahometans. What then became of all their conveniencies of living, of their houses, of their arts, of their cultivated grounds? Wherever there is good land, there is the means of subsistence; and wherever it is not cultivated, where cultivation is known, there population is repressed by other causes than want of subsistence. Moors and Jews and native Spaniards all declined by ecclesiastical tyranny. For the Inquisition, which was instituted by Ferdinand purposely to purge Granada of all remains of Mahometanism and Judaism [1], seized in 1726 three hundred and sixty families convicted of Mahometanism, and confiscated their fortunes [2]; which partial violence was in effect an

[1] Giannone, Storia de Napoli, lib. 22. p. 549.

[2] Swinburne's Travels, p. 168.

act of hostility against the whole population. Shall we say with Mr. Malthus, that the population of Spain, under such circumstances, has kept itself up to the level of the means of subsistence? *or*, that tyranny has ruined the people, their industry,—and that with this declension, subsistence, which includes all the means of living, declined also?

Egypt was comparatively populous, so was Sicily; yet they declined in people, not because there was want of provisions, for they supplied Italy with grain: they declined from tyranny; the provisions continued, but they were swept away by the robbers of mankind.

Mr. Malthus concludes that those who are fed must breed:—this is a beastly opinion. No matter, says he, how unjust or tyrannical is the form of government, and how pernicious the climate, population will keep itself up to the level of subsistence. Truly Mr. Malthus is no sentimentalist; he does not even divide the soul, like some of the ancients, into the sensitive[1] and the nutritive: the extent of a man's platter measures all his capabilities. How many beasts die, sooner than eat when confined! how many who live, disdain to produce their kind! Yet feed man, and he will breed; nay, breed in proportion to his feeding; no matter where, though he be doubly plagued both by climate and despotism.

Miserable philosopher! have you never heard of men, of women devoting themselves and their children to death, sooner than submit to their enemies?—of the Sidonians, when besieged by Artaxerxes[2]?—of the

[1] Aristot. de Anima, lib. 3. c. 11. [2] Diodorus Siculus, lib. 16.

people of Abydos, when besieged by Philip[1]?—of the Phoceans and Acarnanians?—of the Carthaginians[2]? These were promised security if they would emigrate. No, they resisted: the men and women fought to extremity, and then consumed themselves and city, sooner than suffer the triumph of their enemies. Ancient history abounds with examples of similar daring. Carthage, fired by its own people, burned for seventeen days.

But these were republican times, it may be said; the people nourished then extravagant notions of liberty and independence. Certainly the horrors of our monarchical æra, at man's daring to manage his own concerns, were then less distressing than at present. Yet without referring to the conduct of republicans, of whom courtiers and king-adoring parasites can have no idea, I will recall the reader's attention to some particulars within our own acquaintance, and more intelligible to the subjects of kings and princes. I say, slaves frequently will not breed, though fed; frequently they will not live. It is not merely the vagabond Alemanni[3], who roamed licentiously, that will not survive their freedom; nor the citizens of Grecian states, who felt that the only liberty left them was to die[4];—it is common to many nations. In Asia[5], those who run *amuck* are slaves, who kill to be killed. In

[1] Polybius, lib. 16. c. 16. [2] Florus, lib. 2. c. 15.

[3] Dion Cassius says that the women of the Alemanni were asked whether they would be killed or sold;—they answered, Killed. They were sold, and they killed themselves. lib. 77. c. 14.

[4] Τις δ'εστι δουλος; του θανει αφροντιστων. Plutarch. Moral. p. 65.

[5] Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 11. p. 186.

Africa, in capturing the Shangalla [1] many are slain, many precipitate themselves down steeps, or run mad, or hang themselves, or obstinately refuse food and starve themselves. Park [2] mentions also, that the slaves in their passage from the interior to the coast frequently eat clay to destroy themselves. Follow those poor savages to their sad voyage; they not unfrequently fling themselves overboard. And Clarkson [3] mentions on the credit of an eye-witness, that some in the act of drowning wave their hands in triumph of their escape. Accompany them on shore; see the wretched relics of the slaves of Africa labouring in gangs:—judge of their lives by their deaths. Dr. Pinkard and Captain Wilson [4] both attest that the funerals, which in Africa are accompanied with lamentations, are attended in the West Indies with joy and exultation.

This feeling is general. The original inhabitants of St. Domingo, when conquered by the Spaniards, frequently poisoned themselves in parties with the juice of the manioc; and they purposely neglected to cultivate their lands, in order to starve their oppressors. Do these afford a proof of Mr. Malthus's dogma—that men will breed if they are fed? I have shown that beasts will not breed, though indulged with superfluity of food. Why trees, and shrubs, and herbs will not vegetate if they be overtopped, some which grow will not fruit, others will not blossom;—yet man, Feed him, and he will flourish!

Mr. Malthus, in effect, refers man's race to a lower

[1] Bruce's Travels, vol. 3. p. 156. [2] Travels, p. 327.
[3] History of the Slave Trade, vol. 2. p. 223. [4] vol. 3. p. 67.

origin than those who derived him from the ape, or from a quadruped, or with Maillet from the piscatory tribes. Slavery and man are incompatible:—I speak of man as a rational moral being. Slavery stuns and stupefies the civilized creature:—Then how must it operate on those who have not enjoyed habits of intellectual culture? Slavery weakens the arms, and bows the body, the mind, the senses[1]; the appetites, except those which injure, are impaired by it; and it is alike destructive both of the oppressed and their oppressors.

It was so at Rome. Rome, to whom all nations were tributary, lost her people. Even in the time of the Gracchi the free citizens had greatly declined[2]: every effort was made to recruit them; there was a general naturalization, yet they could not support their numbers. Various laws were made to induce the marriage of the people, by rewards, honours, prerogatives, penalties; and these applied to males and females. Soldiers were solicited to marry, contrary to the ancient discipline[3]; and Julius Cæsar ordained that those who bred cattle should have one third of their shepherds freemen:—still the citizens decreased. Marriage became irksome. At first, duty prevailed over convenience, and Metellus reputed marriage a necessary grievance; at last it became intolerable. Did this class of society support its population up to the level of the means of subsistence, and were they celibataries from want? No, rather the contrary: con-

[1] It is the remark of all who have witnessed Europeans on their return from slavery. They are indifferent, doltish, &c.

[2] Plutarch. in Tib. Gracchum. [3] Suetonius, lib. 1. c. 43.

quest and plunder, and a throng of domestic slaves depraved all orders; the women were bad wives, men of course avoided matrimony. Tacitus[1] laments the unchastity of the women; and he ascribes to this vice the ruin of there public. In Claudian's reign, so many free women abandoned themselves to the embraces of slaves[2], it was enacted, that she who, after warning from the master respecting her intercourse with his slave, continued the offence, should become the slave of the master of her paramour[3]. This was one means by which generation was impaired: I have spoken elsewhere of other causes of the ruin of the Roman people. Yet with all means of living, amidst Italy,—supplied with provisions from every shore of the Mediterranean,—even Britain contributed grain to the Romans,—the people were unproductive; they disregarded the continuance of their family[4]: there was no succession from father to son; races frequently ceased with the individuals; and thus, from age to age, the population declined[5].

. Did this happen for want of subsistence?—there was a monstrous superfluity. Crates imputed the ruin of

[1] Impudicitia magnum reip. malorum initium fuit. Annal. 13. c. 45.

[2] Gliscebat supra modum amor ingenuarum mulierum erga servos alienos. Gravina, p. 325.

[3] Nec credi potest qua obsequiorum diversitate coluntur homines sine liberis Romæ. A. Marcellinus, lib. 14. c. 6.

[4] Telemachus particularly laments, ωδε γαρ ὑμετερην γενεην μονυωσε Κρονιων.

[5] ——— Cælibem vitam prebet
Sterilis juventus: hoc erit quicquid vides
Unius ævi turbæ. Seneca Hippol. ver. 465.

tyrannies to excessive food and opulence[1]; and Florus[2] expressly attributed the decline of the Romans to the extent of their possessions and riches. The people were poor, and they obtained bread and plays; but the patricians were not poor, but so rich that no order ever possessed such riches. Apicius considered himself lost, when the residue of his fortune amounted to about 80,000 pounds sterling; and Crassus denied that a man was rich, who could not by his private income support an army[3]. Thus the Romans disappeared,—high and low, plebeians, patricians, and slaves,—though they had the world for their negro-land, and though even the strongest motives were proposed to ensure the procreation of slaves; for female slaves had their *jus trium liberorum*[4], and that boon of their fruitfulness was freedom: yet they all decayed, though the whole known world was the domain of Rome; and *Roman*, from being an epitome of honour among mankind, became the last term of disgrace among barbarians[5]. It was slavery, and with this, want of moral virtue, that wore away the population of Rome; and these will ever, according to their intensity, produce the same consequences. In a tract by Franklin, published at Philadelphia so early as 1751, among the causes of depopulation he principally mentions "the introduction of slaves. The negroes brought into the English sugar-islands have greatly diminished the

[1] Δια τρυφην και πολυτελειαν. Moral. p. 77. [2] lib. 3. c. 12.

[3] Cicero, vol. 4. p. 439.

[4] Fœminis quoque fœcundioribus otium nonnunquam et libertatem dedimus, &c. Columella de Re Rustica, lib. 1. c. 8.

[5] Pliny, at least, said so:—Gentium in toto orbe præstantissima una omni virtute haud dubie Romano. Hist. Nat. lib. 7. c. 40.

whites there: the poor are by this means deprived of employment, while a few families acquire vast estates, which they spend in foreign luxuries, and educating their children in the habits of those luxuries: the same income is needed for the support of one, that might have maintained one hundred. The whites who have slaves, not labouring are enfeebled, and therefore not so generally prolific: the slaves being worked too hard and ill-fed, their constitutions are broken, and the deaths among them are more than the births; so that a continual supply is needed from Africa. The northern colonies having few slaves, increase in whites," &c.

Here we have an abstract of the declension of imperial Rome in the perverted progress of a sugar-plantation. Italy had been laboured by freemen, and it was opulent in all productions; but under the culture of slaves it became sterile and effete. In St. Domingo the ground was cultivated by whites, and it is now cultivated by them. But what is still more important, St. Domingo[1], which required an annual importation of 29,000 negroes before the revolution, and though multitudes of its people perished during that crisis, 500,000 adults being reduced to 300,000; though violence, outrage, and war continued; though the females and males have been very disproportioned; yet under the semblance of freedom the children in St. Domingo have greatly increased. Did food prepare the way for freedom, or liberty provide food?—ask, Does the yellow corn impart rays to the sun? or does the sun infuse its splendour into the ripened grain? On the same ground, the same people who perished under

[1] Malouet, Mem. t. 1. p. 52.

a Christian government of white people, at the rate of thirty thousand men annually,—under a new government of negroes, lately slaves, and during the fury of a revolution, increased prodigiously in people and their comforts.

Liberty is the want of man. Von Sach, speaking of the slaves in Surinam, says, though well-treated, they are declining in number, while the Bush Negroes, who escaped from this wasting colony into the woods, have increased so as to press on the possessions of their former masters. Did they find a feast of nature in the wilderness? No; but they carried with them an independent spirit; and this procured for them what their masters and fellow-countrymen, with their cultivated fields, and capital, and accommodations, could not attain.

CHAPTER IV.

Some writers superciliously indifferent respecting the possibility of increasing population.—Dr. Jarrold's mind-check.—*Surgeon Birch.—Mr. Malthus.—Mr. Weyland.*

WHILE some are anxious to increase the people heedlessly, without regarding their wants or their wishes,—as Mr. Anderson [1], who in his "Calm Investigation" considers it stronger than gospel, "*that the means of subsistence must rather be augmented than diminished by the augmentation of its population;*" —others, on the contrary, regard an increase of people

[1] Mr. Anderson has not studied Sir Anthony Absolute's character, "Can't be calm like me," when the old man suffers a paroxysm of passion.

as a tide without ebb, which must eventually extinguish human life by an excess of human beings. It might be hoped that such extravagancies would countervail each other; that the former would have ceased, as it has in the Highlands: "His (the Highlander's) glory and felicity consisted in the extent of his fold and the number of his family; he could never have too many children or too many cows, however great the difficulty might be of rearing the first to maturity, or providing fodder for the last." This superstition of the Highlands has changed, as I have shown, for its opposite.

Not so, however, in England. Both extremes have their advocates. Mr. Gray thinks there cannot be too many people; Mr. Malthus, that there cannot be too few. Indeed Dr. Gillum embraces in some measure both parties, in which he is not particular. He says, that if inoculation had been wisely practised so late as 1665, "the lives of one hundred thousand inhabitants might have been saved, exclusive of their offspring, and *nati natorum et qui nascuntur ab illis.*" Here Dr. Gillum propagates by the geometrical scale of Mr. Malthus, and feeds them by Mr. Anderson's sympathizing ratio.

"———————— I the praise
Yield thee, so well this day thou hast purvey'd."

While some consider, in the vulgar phrase, "the more mouths the better cheer;" or, on the contrary, with Mr. Malthus, that many include misery; some assume a rare indifference, and superciliously discredit the possibility of a superabundant population. Dr.

Jarrold proclaims his checks as well as his opponent Mr. Malthus; and the chief is the improvement of the mind. Not, observe, as teaching prudence, but as stinting the generative faculty. He says; "As man sinks down to the animal, he is prolific; as he ascends above, his fruitfulness decreases[1]." I thought man was an animal[2]; and that the savage, the lowest gradation of mankind, was the least fruitful. In the sequel it seems to have occurred to Dr. Jarrold, that savages are unproductive: but this no way impedes his doctrine; and according to the custom of such theorists, it confirms it: "In a word, mental apathy as strongly characterizes this class (peasants), as vigilance and anxiety do those of the savage and the philosopher[3]." Happy classification! the mind-check embraces others:—"Those who enjoy any rank in a civilized country; who stand at its head, either in intellect or power; stretch their capacity to the utmost, that they may acquit themselves with credit in the stations they fill. This exertion of the mind is, in the view I take of the subject, the efficient cause of the few generations an estate is enjoyed by such a family, or rather that such a family exists to possess it[4]." This is the height of genius; as it invents a fact, and then draws a fanciful consequence from its own imagination. No doubt the straining of royal

[1] Dissertations on Man, p. 250.

[2] Charles Abbot, in his Parochial Divinity, makes the same distinction. He speaks of Hydra and Cerberus, and "the animal, the feathered, and the vegetable classes." p. 122.

[3] Dissertations, &c. p. 269.

[4] This writer admits the fact of the quick extinction of such families. I have given another reason.

wit is agony—for lately, nine out of the ten legitimate ruling princes of Europe were drivellers or insane. The Doctor considers it a vulgar error, that prostitutes are barren on account of *their promiscuous intercourse ;* he says, *They owe their sterility to the influence of their mind*[1].

Dr. Jarrold, having so reasoned on the intellectual check, quotes Gibbon, who said that the Athenians fell from 30,000 to 21,000 in the best days of their republic. I repeat, that during the interval of the two census many thousand Athenians were disfranchised, and the latter census succeeded immediately a great plague. So much for history :—Now for existing facts and speculations. He says, " The present inhabitants of America will in a few centuries people that continent; but the rate will not continue to be as it is now, it will diminish in proportion as the mental faculties are exerted[2]." The Americans, then, now think little. He also says, " It is my aim establish the fact,—that the most thoughtful people, taken as a body, are the least prolific[3]." How does this agree with the *thinking people* of Britain, and their increase from 1800 to 1810? Or is this a random stroke at the insensate state of the public mind for the last half century, from hostilities begun at Boston about a three-penny tea-duty, to.....

Surgeon Birch[4] is equally at his ease in contemplating the excess of population, provided diseases have fair play. He says, " that when such pains are taken to magnify the victims to the small-pox, why is

[1] Dissertations, &c. p. 258. [2] p. 281. [3] p. 273.
[4] Fatal Effects of Cow-pox.

it not remembered that, in the populous parts of the metropolis, this pestilential disease is considered a merciful provision on the part of Providence to lessen the burthen of a poor man's family?" This does approach the new doctrines of population and production, as far as medicine is comparable to political œconomy. This disregards man, and depopulates to procure a surplus produce for the survivors—while that would cherish a mortal disease in pure love of humanity. How far Mr. Malthus may be classed with Mr. Birch, I leave to the reader to decide from the following passage. Having mentioned, among the causes, foreign trade and colonial emigrations [1], he adds, "and the extreme unhealthiness of a great part of the country, which occasions a much greater average mortality than is common in other states. These I conceive were the unobserved causes which principally contributed to render Holland so famous for the management of her poor, and able to employ and support all who applied for it." Here, distinctly, disease and rapid mortality are reputed the principal causes by which Holland was enabled to support its poor with distinguished facility.—Towards the conclusion of this work I shall explain the true cause of Holland's superiority in providing for its poor.

Some again treat as notional the possibility of an excessive population in England; for, say they, one-

[1] vol. 2. p. 334. Emigration is no cause: for he elsewhere admits that the population of Holland was not upheld by propagation, as there was a great influx of foreigners. vol. 1. p. 376. And in other places he speaks of the bad effects of unhealthy countries to population--But he wanted a reason.

third of the people live in towns large enough to prevent the inhabitants from reproducing their numbers; that is, the excess of births in the country must find a premature death in the towns. This mortal consolation is mentioned by Mr. Weyland, jun. in his "Essay on Population and Production," who seems on this occasion to pride himself on a discovery. The greater mortality of towns was known for ages, and to none more than the English. But mark the different conclusions of three English writers. Mr. Weyland considers the mortality of towns a remedy for any excess of population; Dr. Price, a ruin; while Mr. Malthus, somewhat melancholy, says, "In spite of our increasing towns and manufactures, the demand on the country for people is by no means very pressing[1]." Yet Ireland still more perplexes their science: it is a country concerning which more nonsense has been uttered than of all European nations together. What Africa was formerly[2], Ireland is now; for Libya and novelty, we must substitute Ireland and wonders.

CHAPTER V.

Dissertation on Population in Ireland.—Mr. Malthus's—Mr. Weyland's—Mr. Ricardo's—Mr. Grahame's opinions, &c. exposed.—The poverty and populousness of Ireland truly explained.

THE people of Ireland are numerous and poor.—On this association sages infer, either that they are poor because they are numerous, or that they are nume-

[1] vol. 1. p. 466.

[2] Ὅτι αει φερει τι Λιβυη καινον. Aristot. Hist. Animal. lib. 8. c. 28.

rous because they are poor. Other reasons are assigned for the populousness of Ireland. Sir John Davies states their infinite multiplication *from living on the milk of the cow*. Mr. Arthur Young[1] rails against the linen manufacture; Lawrence[2] against the great plenty of provisions, which he says is a main impediment to the trade and wealth of Ireland. Mr. Malthus concentrates his rage against potatoes. These are samples of the philosophy on Ireland. The sages have proposed remedies accordingly. Mr. Weyland[3]

[1] Tour in Ireland, vol. 2. p. 132. [2] State of Ireland, p. 7.

[3] Mr. Curwen also, in his Letters on Ireland, published in 1818, says: "The greatest political alteration that could take place in this distressed country, would be a dislike to potatoes, and a general preference in the rising generation to bread and animal food." vol. 2. p. 31. Does he imagine the Irish have Hindoo prejudices, and abhor animal food? Suppose them flesh eaters—would this reduce the tithes paid by a Catholic people to a Protestant clergy? And the composition for these tithes he admits is greater in Ireland than in England. vol. 1. p. 385. Will eating bread and beef exonerate their manufactures and commerce? Will it liberate the Catholics in respect to the Protestants? or both in respect to their rights? Will it send the Englishman, whose ancestor obtained mighty districts by confiscation, to reside on his iniquitous inheritance? Will it stop the emigration, in consequence of the Union, of lords and commoners, and restore the three millions of rents annually wrested from the laborious poor of Ireland, and sent to absentees? which three millions, considering that the taxation of Ireland can only be made to produce one-eleventh of the public revenue of Great Britain, are equal to thirty-three millions annually transferred from Great Britain. The Irish have only eaten potatoes for two centuries; but for many centuries they have suffered the tyranny of Great Britain: and they have been miserable, as have been all oppressed nations, eat what they may. Mr. Curwen says, truly, "Place man in that state in which, as a rational creature, he ought to be, and Ireland would be the delight of all beholders." p. 71.

calls the imputed excess of people in Ireland a *nuisance*; and talks of "the mere excrescence of the body politic eradicated to its great relief, if the operation could be effected without infringing the laws of humanity[1]." He probably feared to be more precise; as Swift, indignant at the oppressions of the Irish, had said ironically, "I am touched with a sensible pleasure when I hear of a mortality in a country, parish, or village." Mr. Weyland should know that the radical remedy had been applied to Ireland—the population of Ireland had been eradicated; and I have already quoted a passage from Temple to that purport. Mr. Weyland would correct the nuisance by "the method of absorption, slow and tedious as the process may be." While Mr. Malthus takes summary vengeance on the Irish, calling them *degraded*[2]; *in total want of decent pride*; *that they propagate their species like brutes*[3]. Whence this outrage? The Irish are prolific; but so were the Jews in Egypt[4]: And what proof is there that the Jews were more comfortable than the Irish? The Irish, it is true, negative one of Mr. Malthus's mighty dogmas—that population can never be very rapid, except where the price of labour is very high. Yet the price of Jewish labour was not higher perhaps in Egypt than labour in Ireland. Mr. Malthus proposes an *absorption* of potatoes, those peccant humours of a fertile soil: they are perniciously cheap[5]; for, speaking of Ireland, this

[1] On Population and Production, p. 220.

[2] vol. 2. p. 332.

[3] vol. 2. p. 336.

[4] Mr. Malthus, the reader may remember, has assumed this increase; and on his assumption I argue.

[5] vol. 1. p. 504.

accurate reasoner prefers food which is dear—that is, which is scarce—that is, plenty is misery in Ireland, though it is all things elsewhere. He would absorb potatoes, and substitute some dearer food (this is literally his project), which would extinguish all those people who are now enabled to live by the cheaper food. What is the use of machinery, or improved tillage, or encouragement to fishing; but to abridge labour, increase production,—in fine, cheapen the means of living? To favour a dearer food is to prefer operose agriculture, sterile land, and an inhospitable climate. Thus this soi-disant *friend to population when it follows its natural order*, decisively recommends extinguishing the people by enhancing their food. A capital concern of society is to produce the greatest benefit with the least toil. That potatoes are beneficial, all may witness: the Irish feel they are good. If then they satisfy those who use them, and those who use them are vigorous—what could they gain by eating wheat or rice, &c.? I cannot perceive that Mr. Malthus would object to potatoes, if they were double their present price. As he found a philosopher in Swisserland among the peasants, he might find another in Ireland:—"Master Hamilton," said a labourer, "you may talk of your new-fangled plans and all that; but there never was plenty in the county of Meath, since every plough had not six horses, and every horse had not a leader." If the Irish were fed by wheat, or even by potatoes produced by such a retinue, what a reformation would take place in the *rags and mud cabins* of Ireland! Food would be most felicitously dear.

Mr. Ricardo[1] also prescribes: "The remedy for the evils under which Poland and Ireland suffer, which are similar to those experienced in the South Seas, is to stimulate exertion, to create new wants, and to implant new tastes: for those countries must accumulate a much larger amount of capital before the diminished rate of production will render the progress of capital necessarily less rapid than the progress of population. The facility with which the wants of the Irish are supplied, permits that people to pass a great part of their time in idleness: if the population were diminished, this evil would increase, because wages would rise; and therefore the labourer would be enabled, in exchange for a still less portion of his labour, to obtain all that his moderate wants require." As Mr. Malthus classes the Spaniards and Irish with the brutes, Mr. Ricardo places the Poles and Irish with the savages of the South Seas. But there is this difference; Mr. Malthus would feed the Irish on the dearer substance, and he would have their wages regulated by it[2]. How could this serve the capitalist? for raising the price of food would diminish the population, and increasing the wages of labour would lessen the profits of capital.

Mr. Ricardo is not so absurd: he does not propose a dearer food or higher wages,—but to excite new appetites, and so straighten their facility of living as to counteract this imputed habitual idleness of the Irish. The increase of wages is hostile to his whole system. He says[3]: "It has been my endeavour to

[1] Political Œconomy, p. 101. [2] vol. 2. p. 383.

[3] Political Œconomy, p. 154.

show throughout this work, that the rate of profits can never be increased but by a fall of wages; and there can be no permanent fall of wages, but in consequence of a fall of the necessaries on which wages are expended." Mr. Ricardo is consequential in error, a happiness which Mr. Malthus rarely possesses.—I must however withdraw my doubtful praise of Mr. Ricardo's consistency, when he says; "Give to the Irish labourer a taste for the comforts and enjoyments which habit has made essential to the English labourer, and he would then be content to devote a further portion of his time to industry, that he might be enabled to obtain them." His own substantive account[1] of an English labourer is no object of admiration. What! are poor's-rates and workhouses among his comforts and enjoyments? Yet they are essential to him. But how are these tastes to be excited in Irish labourers? Is it supposed they are not like other human creatures? but that they make choice of privations? Perhaps Mr. Ricardo abstained from offering a special remedy, being deterred by the failure of Mr. Malthus's grand specific for poverty in Ireland.

If Mr. Ricardo,—whose general sentiments and character I should willingly praise, if I could stop to eulogize an individual when I resented a nation's wrongs,—has afforded no hints how these *tastes* are to be excited, Mr. Weyland has adopted Mr. Malthus's nostrum with marvellous mysticism[2]: "The very extent of the population (of Ireland) offers something like a physical impediment to the improvement of their society. But I am not entirely without hope

[1] p. 111. [2] On Population, p. 102.

that the check which has lately been given to the exportation of corn from Ireland, by reducing its price and encouraging its consumption among the lowest ranks of the people, may tempt them to desert their potatoes for bread, which would advance them more rapidly towards better habits than may at first sight be imagined." How? unless the potatoe be the forbidden fruit, and wheat the bread of life!

Observe, that from these writers nothing escapes respecting the government, or the laws, or the judicature, or the state of property, or tithes, or tenancy, &c. No, the Irish are the sinners, and the scapegoat is the potatoe. Feed them on corn! Why the Poles do not eat potatoes, and they are poor and miserable. Are potatoes and wretchedness homogeneous in Ireland?—The Irish were miserable before a potatoe was planted in Europe.

Mr. Malthus riots in his abuse of the Irish, while no breath escapes him of the wide-wasting mischiefs which have immemorially beset this people. He talks of the Irish now as Strabo did. *The details of their population*, says Mr. Malthus[1], *are little known*: and oh! hideous! they eat potatoes! So the geographer[2]: "Nihil dicere manifestum habemus, hoc duntaxat excepto, quod longe magis quam Britanni sylvestres illius sunt incolæ anthropophagi manducones-que magni." And as abuse is never complete without a contrasting panegyric, he opposes the Scotch to the Irish[3]: "the quiet and peaceable habits of the instructed Scotch peasant compared with the turbulent disposition of the ignorant Irishman." Sup-

[1] vol. 1. p. 504. [2] lib. 4. t. 1. p. 365. [3] vol. 2. p. 344.

pose this to be true, which is false,—what causes the difference between the Scotch and Irish? The northern Irish are principally Scotch, and each country had the same name[1], as they possessed a common people. Besides, the Highlanders particularly eat potatoes like the Irish, and have increased in consequence. Lord Selkirk says, that in 1755 the population of the Highlands amounted to 255,845, and in 1801 they increased to 296,844. This he attributes to the universal use of potatoes, which were scarcely known at the time of the former calculation. Now the Scotch were something more than turbulent in 1717 and 1745, when they did not eat potatoes. Since that time potatoes have been a sedative to them; though they have been so inflammatory in Ireland, saving and excepting in the year 1817, when Ireland was tranquil, and non-potatoe-eating England was insurrectionary and treasonable.

Mr. Malthus says nothing of provincial misrule; nothing of one-tenth of the people absorbing exclusively all honours and profits; nothing of middlle-men and subsetting; nothing of absentees draining through a thousand conduits, thousands and millions, and affording no return; nothing of a severe tithing system, which robs a Catholic population to enrich a Protestant ministry, who do not administer; nothing of exciting disgust, exasperating animosity, inflaming sectarian hate—an aggravated and multifarious iniquity, which for length of time and excesses has

[1] Temple says: Ireland and Scotland were called Scotia, and the north-west parts of Ireland and Scotland were called Ierne. Works, vol. 2. p. 533.

no parallel. Nay, Mr. Grahame, another writer on population, says[1]: "A system of misgovernment and oppression, *long since abandoned*, has bred among the people of Ireland a tendency to mistake the cause of their sufferings, and consequently the remedy of which they admitted: it has bred a habit of considering their government as the source of every evil, and of resorting to indolent clamour and furious rebellion against this imaginary cause of hardship, in place of that active exertion which is the natural consequence and the natural remedy of the only hardships to which they are exposed." Here is another *natural* philosopher: "That a monster should be such a natural!"

I shall briefly relate the conduct of England to Ireland up to the present hour.—Henry the Second[2] came to assist M'Murough of Leinster; and, as usual with such friends, he attempted to conquer Ireland for himself. To effect this, he was of course moved by the worthiest motives, and we find loyalty and true religion,—Adrian the Third cooperating with Henry the Second in this good office; for the Irish were once independent both of England and Rome; church and state being then under *domestic nomination*[3]. Popes and kings continued their joint achieve-

[1] p. 299. [2] Macartney's Post. Works, vol. 2. p. 97.

[3] The Irish are very much altered. Some time since they were such papists!—That was the cry. Now, since the English restored the Pope, they are not papists enough!—in short, any thing for the benefit of an objection. The Irish Catholics were once notorious for their superstition; "De tous les Catholiques Romains, il n'y en a point de si superstitieux, ni qui ayent une si grande veneration pour tout ce qui vient de Rome, que les Irlan-

ments. In Edward the Second's reign, says Hume [1], "the horrible and absurd oppressions which the Irish suffered under the English governments made them at first fly to the Scots, whom they regarded as deliverers." The same historian, reflecting cumulatively on all the British acts towards Ireland, calls them *to the last degree absurd*. The army was supported by *free quarters*. "Thrown [2] out of the protection of justice, the natives could find no security but in force; and flying the neighbourhood [3] of cities, which they could not approach with safety, they sheltered themselves in their marshes and forests from the insolence of their inhuman masters; being treated like wild beasts, they became such," &c. There never was so flagitious a government. Spenser [4] mentions a law, which declared, that if an Irishman converse with an Englishman he shall be condemned as a spy. The Irish bards were murdered for those virtues which

dois; parce qu'il n'y en a point si ignorants." Wickefort, Ambassadeurs, &c. p. 433. Their knowledge is improved mightily by their treatment of Quarantotie's document.

[1] vol. 2. p. 342. [2] vol. 5. p. 396.

[3] I have seen on different hills, or rather mountains, the marks of ridges which have not been cultivated in the memory of any living person. I imagine these remote and inhospitable tracts were the refuge of some during these desolations. It is so in other places: Bruce, speaking of the Mountains of the Moon, says they are excellent soil; but as this unfortunate country has been for ages the theatre of war, the inhabitants have only ploughed and sown the tops of them. Travels, vol. 4. p. 262. So Van Egmont laments the fine plain near Tiberias left barren; the inhabitants cultivating the mountains to avoid the Arabs. Travels, vol. 2. p. 38.

[4] State of Ireland, p. 48.

crowned the bravest names of Greece with imperishable glory; and Spenser [1], a traitor to poetry and patriotism, justified the crime. The harp, in which the Irish excelled, was proscribed, in order that history, and private reputation, and all the brave, generous, mild, and endearing passions might eventually perish. What country ever so suffered? Not Sicily, not Greece, which has endured all sorts of barbarians from Goths to Ottomans for twenty-three successive centuries.

With Elizabeth's reign a new distinction arose. The inhabitants in Ireland had been distinguished by the English, and the *mere Irish*. Then they were divided into Protestants and Catholics. As the Irishry were persecuted before, so were the Catholics afterward. Coke, in his pleading against Essex, accuses him, that when chief governor of Ireland he granted "a public toleration of an idolatrous religion." As by 4 Hen. V. c. 6. no Irishman was to be promoted in the church of Ireland, so no Catholic subsequently was to be advanced in the army: and Stafford [2] in his defence declared, "he never preferred any captain, lieutenant, or ensign, to be of that army, that was a papist." The policy of James, so vaunted respecting Ireland, was principally to dispossess the Irish and substitute British colonists. Thus the Irish were persecuted, oppressed, subjected to free quarters. Stafford says [3], *Ireland had been at all times*

[1] p. 123.

[2] State Trials, vol. 1. p. 825. This exclusion was not peculiar. 4 Hen. IV. no Welshman was to be an officer in Wales. Law Dict. vol. 2. p. 755.

[3] State Trials, vol. 1. p. 838.

accustomed to such summary proceedings. The Irish, desperate by their suffering, and seconded by the insurrection in Scotland and the civil war in England, endeavoured to resume their rights; as did Boadicea, Caractacus, and Alfred, to liberate Britain.

Hume (and I rather quote from this cautious author) says of the English, "By continuing their violent persecution, and still more violent menaces, against priests and papists, they confirmed the Irish Catholics in their rebellion.—By disposing before-hand of all the Irish forfeitures to subscribers or adventurers, they rendered all men of property desperate, and seemed to threaten a total extirpation of the natives." The hatred of the British to the Irish, which descended to the Catholics, inflamed the British against the English Catholics. Chief Justice North[1] said on Collyer's trial, "for I must tell you, the papists are best extirpated and suppressed by a steady prosecution of the laws against them." And another Chief Justice, Pemberton[2], said respecting the Popish plot, which no anti-Catholic however fanatic now credits, "There is *digitus Dei* in the discovery of it."

William the Third signed the treaty of Limerick the 3d of October 1689, and on the 22d of the same month this solemn act was broken: the English parliament excluding Catholics from both houses of the Irish parliament, by requiring each member, preparatory to admission, to take the oath of supremacy. In 1695 the Catholics were deprived of all means of educating their children—of being their guardians, &c[3].

[1] State Trials, vol. 3. p. 461. [2] Ibid. vol. 2. p. 747.

[3] Jura sanguinis nullo jure civili dirimi potest, says the Digest.

On the 4th of March 1704 it was enacted, That any son of a Catholic who should apostatize to the Protestant faith, should immediately succeed to the family estate. An entailed estate (Catholics being esteemed civilly dead) was to be enjoyed by the next Protestant in succession. Catholics could not purchase land, nor be tenants for life. Observe, these and the following statutes were enacted without provocation, the Irish being tranquil and submissive. In 1709, wives of Papists apostatizing were to receive increased jointures. No Papist was to keep a school. For discovering a Papist usher, the informer was to receive 10*l.*; for discovering a priest, 20*l.*; for discovering a bishop, 50*l.* Justices of the peace were enabled to force Papists to inform against Popish priests. By 1 Geo. II. c. 9., no Papist was allowed to vote for a member of parliament. These goads and torments were continued, were repeated, were aggravated. Submission was unavailing; suffering could not assuage; reason, policy, character could not control. In the mean time a shout of liberty across the Atlantic was heard, and the fears of Britain brought hope to Ireland. So much for the political situation of Ireland at the commencement of the American war.

Consider the duress and persecution of the Irish trade and manufactures, of its tillage and pasturing.

The legislation of Ireland is in direct opposition to all maxims of equity; yet in all periods the Irish lawyers praised the excellent constitution of church and state, and the beauty of the Irish jurisprudence. Thus in Scotland the small-pox is honoured with an attribute of Venus by the vulgar.

By 18 Charles II. c. 2. importations of cattle from Ireland were declared a nuisance; by the 30th of the same king, the introduction of mutton and lamb was prohibited [1]. The same brooding mischief blasted its agriculture. And observe, this was not against the Irishry or the Catholics, but against Ireland, which the rascal policy of England would render poor and wretched, a burthen and a disgrace to her. With regard to Ireland's agriculture, it was proposed that the Irish farmer should lay out five acres in every hundred in tillage; which the English interest discountenanced, not because it was absurd,—no, but lest Ireland should become agricultural.

It may be said, This is true;—but then how careful has England been in protecting the staple of Ireland —the linen manufacture! England's attention to this manufacture was a mere imposition. The measures for the promotion of the growth of flax, &c. constantly attended the attempt directly to destroy the woollen manufacture. Stafford's politics, Sir William Temple's [2] recommendations, Davenant's advice, favoured the one to aid the ruin of the other. The English woolcombers and weavers persuaded their countrymen that the woollen manufactures were the wealth of Britain: and so insensate were their best writers on this point, that Davenant [3], who saw clearly, and who said that the prohibition of the import of Irish cattle was to serve the northern and western counties at the expense of England, could not see that the prohibition of Irish woollens was to serve

[1] Law Dict. vol. 2. p. 438. Decker on Trade, p. 52.

[2] Miscellanies, vol. 1. p. 113. [3] Works, vol. 1. p. 46.

certain manufacturing districts at the general expense of the nation. On this point his heart was as hard, as his eye was dull; for of the laws respecting the woollens of Ireland he says, "Where the commonwealth is truly concerned, and where her safety is in question, they have very narrow minds who let their compassion be too much extended to private objects[1]."

In 1698 the English commons addressed William, stating "that the wealth and peace of England do in a great measure depend in preserving the woollen manufacture as much as possible entire to that realm:" and they request him to extinguish the woollen trade of Ireland. His majesty graciously answered that he would fulfil their wishes; and his conduct in consequence should be remembered by those who are interested for the veracity of princes. The woollen manufacture was destroyed in Ireland, where it had flourished for centuries; as it appears by a paper of Lord Charlemont's in the Irish Transactions, that in the fourteenth century Ireland had a considerable reputation at Florence for such manufactures. The manufacture was extinguished at once; for the king and parliament, and their officers, made an ultra-Luddite war on the woollen manufacture of the whole nation. In 1699, says Dr. Ledwich, "the town of Burros, and indeed the whole parish, were filled with combers and weavers; but after the passing of the act they converted their property into money, and became farmers[2]:" that is, with the wreck of their property they began to struggle in a new trade to support their existence. Shall we then be told of this and that man, and this

[1] Works, vol. 2. p. 246.

[2] Account of Aghaboe, p. 88.

and that law to promote the linen manufacture, as a set-off for this barbarity? What were these laws? One was passed in 1672, obliging farmers to sow so much flax-seed. This appears to have operated as a grievous penal law; for Temple says, "A general neglect in the execution and common guilt has rendered the penalties impracticable[1]." Long before Stafford's arrival in Ireland (the supposed creator of the linen manufacture in Ireland) it existed. It is clear, from the 13th of Elizabeth, that the Irish had habitually, at least a century preceding this act, exported wool, flax, linen and woollen yarns. Then, why are we to suppose that linen cloth was not made, when yarn was spun abundantly? It is perfectly certain that they who grow flax, and manufacture and export linen yarn, do not require the imputed magic of a slender bounty[2] to convert it into drapery. The Dublin Society, in their wisdom, attempted to form a silk manufacture in Ireland, by giving three per cent. to the wholesale purchasers of Irish silks who should retail them. What did this bounty effect?

The sordid cowardice of Britain having ended the woollen manufacture in Ireland, the free export[3] of wool from Ireland was also prohibited by the 1st of William and Mary, c. 32. s. 6. No wool was to be shipped from Ireland, except from particular ports, in order the more securely to monopolize the Irish wool

[1] vol. 1. p. 114.

[2] Anderson says it had never exceeded in any year 13,000*l.* History of Commerce, vol. 5. p. 384.

[3] Decker says, the export of woollens being prohibited, the wool was exported to France. On Trade, p. 55.

for the British manufacturers. This was further enforced by the 12th Geo. II. Ships also, by act of parliament, were directed to cruize round Britain and Ireland, to prevent the unlawful export of woollens. 5 Geo. II. c. 21, Ireland could neither export nor import except through England. Before 1780 Ireland could not export directly to the British West Indies, beef, pork, &c.; and when she obtained, by the 24th Geo. II. c. 13, a relaxation in her favour, and was permitted to import directly West India produce, there were excepted from the privilege, "sugars, tobacco, indigo, cotton, wool, molasses, ginger, pitch, tar, turpentine, masts, spars, bowsprits, speckee, woad, Jamaica wood," &c. that is, the numerous exceptions negatived the general permission. This might be considered an insult; yet such were British indulgencies to Ireland.

I shall not speak of the pernicious projects of Irish politicians according to their notions of serving Ireland, nor of the crimes of the Irish leaders in parliament, who, for the tenth of the tithe of the nation's substance, sold and resold their country to the English ministry, but come at once to the reign of George the Third. Here we are greeted by a new æra. Supposing that wisdom displaced folly, the virtue of one reign could have imperfect influence in redeeming a country from centuries of misrule. With this new æra the parliament of Ireland in 1768, which had been of indefinite duration, was made octennial [1]. The next year, 1769, a question occurred relative to the mode of originating money-bills. Sir

[1] Annual Register, 1768, p. 231.

G. Macartney, the secretary, told the Irish Commons, "that the money-bill taking its rise in the privy council, was a tax the commons of Ireland paid for a continuance of their constitution [1]." Mark the precious constitution, and its price! At this period, and long preceding, the pension-list far exceeded in amount the whole expense of the civil list. In 1771, in Lord Townshend's administration, this auxiliary fund, and all other modes of bribery, were inadequate; and the lord lieutenant, to ensure a majority, found it necessary to create "new places, new pensions, new boards [2]." The American war forced the English government to reflect; and in 1782 an arrangement was made between the two countries, which was called a *final adjustment*.

Ireland had been left defenceless during the American war. On this the Irish arose and formed a popular army for their defence. The weakness of England revealed the strength of the Irish; and the French revolution heightened the presumption of the oppressed. Nine-tenths of the people were and are rejected even from the possibility of enjoying the higher offices in their own country. At this time a vain unprincipled youth determined to depress his country by means which no honest man would use for its exaltation. Pitt wanted a substitute, and Castlereagh presented himself: "Make not thyself an underling to a foolish man." Castlereagh made himself that underling; and what the government spy Oliver was at Derby, &c. Castle-

[1] Annual Register, 1769, p. 156.

[2] Hardy's Life of Lord Charlemont, p. 292.

reagh[1] was in Ireland. Castlereagh began by advocating parliamentary reform, and he annihilated the parliament of his own country. His assistance in subverting and transferring forcibly, Norway, Genoa, Saxony, Venice, Ragusa, to despots, is but a self-attestation of his domestic treachery.

By what means and at what time was this measure carried? During martial law, during rebellion provoked and rebellion purposely continued[2], while the guard-rooms were open theatres of torture[3]. Yet these means, and the utmost prodigality to seduce the sordid, failed. In the next year the measure was resumed; when more peerages were granted, more pen-

[1] Some have compared him to Poynings. It is a slander on that monster to assimilate them. Bacon says, "Poynings, the better to make compensation of his service in the wars, called a parliament." But Castlereagh's compensation in the fomented civil wars was to annihilate the parliament.

[2] This sort of grand policy is not peculiar. Relative to the rebellion in Scotland, Temple says, "Lord Shaftesbury showed plainly in council, and in other places, that he was unwilling the rising should be wholly or too soon suppressed," &c. Temple, vol. 1. p. 339. To this may be added a statement of Franklin: He says he was, when in England, informed that a great personage studied much a book entitled *Arcana Imperii*. In this, he says, "a particular king is applauded for his politically exciting a rebellion among his subjects at a time when they had not strength to support it; that he might, in subduing them, take away their privileges, which were troublesome to them," &c. p. 252. The Irish were troublesome; they voted the regency of Ireland to the Prince of Wales before William Pitt had granted leave and fixed the conditions.

[3] Lord Moira (speech 1812, Examiner, No. 218,) could once say so. Judkin Fitzgerald, afterwards ennobled, boasted of his torturing.

sions, places, promises, were given;—seven of the twelve Irish judges were the immediate judicial fruits of passing the Union.

Now what has England gained by this? what has England lost? thou impotent in wickedness! What has Ireland lost?—A total disregard to her affairs. The Irish chancellor of the exchequer, and the last she is ever to possess, said "he hoped that the house would do him the justice of admitting he troubled them upon that subject (Ireland) as seldom as possible." Trouble to hear the affairs of many millions of people, whose duty is to attend to the petition of the meanest individual! Yet no doubt the chancellor of the exchequer understood his audience. The affairs of Ireland are very contemptible, when the whole state was committed to a stranger, to Mr. Peel, an English boy from an English college, who eulogized Orangemen, and posted to Calais to run his head against a pistol. He was the representative, the executive, and the *dernier ressort* of all that concerned Ireland[1]. No inquiry concerning the state of Ireland[2], though it wanted, beside other military, 25,000 regular troops; and though the curfew, the policy of William the Norman, was declared necessary for the existence of government.

[1] Last year it was proposed to stop distillation. Mr. Peel insisted, in the House of Commons, that there were plenty of provisions in Ireland: in consequence the distillers continued; the beggarly government received the excise; and the people suffered, first by the general enhancement of the grain, then by famine, and its consequence a wide-spreading malignant typhus fever.

[2] This is an old complaint. Lord Charlemont said, Neither the removal, nor even the investigation, has ever been seriously attempted. Hardy's Life of Lord Charlemont, p. 173.

Such have been the consequences of the union; a measure beyond the power of the House of Commons of Ireland to determine, unless a trust for a few years by self-appointment can become a property for ever, and a servant by self-will justify a mastery over his lord. What has been the consequence? An abuse of public money that is incredible; salaries of viceroys, ministers, judges, &c., greatly increased; boards added, large sums voted to them, and these in a great measure absorbed by their chief officers. The inland navigation board has been marked for prodigality even in this country, and the principal canal company has become insolvent. With the union, also, the national debt (so little was due before that event, may be said to have originated; and such is its amount, that the whole revenue, taxed and retaxed as the people are, is inadequate to the amount of many millions to pay the general expenditure. Yet did Lord Castlereagh, in February 1800, insist that "the union, by establishing a fair principle of contribution, tends to release Ireland from an expense of one million in time of war, and of 500,000 in time of peace." And, like every other promise, the taxes of Ireland have been disproportionably advanced in respect to England. Ireland has been so oppressed since the union, that, having no domestic store, she was forced to borrow millions abroad to liquidate part of the interest of the national debt forced on her, beside millions to supply her current expenses; while her revenue, her produce, and her commerce decline. To this sad distress and monstrous bankruptcy has Ireland been reduced since the union. Yet in the middle of the last century, when

power ran in the narrowest channels, and the *undertakers* thrived[1]; the revenue exceeded the expenditure, and a surplus actually accumulated in the treasury. It is also remarkable, that while in 1816 seventeen millions of taxes were taken off the British, three hundred and forty thousand pounds only were taken off Ireland; and that in 1817, when 1,500,000*l.* were granted to relieve the British, only 250,000*l.* were granted to the Irish, who are at least half as numerous as the British, and poorer, and want the relief of poor laws. Consider the effects of the union in other respects:—the terms of that contract have been construed exactly in the same spirit in which they were imposed. The English parliament, to favour the British distillers, have repeatedly infringed the Act of Union. Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Fitzgerald, both ministers of the crown, declared this iniquity. To which Mr. Vansittart replied, "That no gentleman had a greater respect for the Act of Union than he had, and no person was more sincerely determined to support it; *but* on account of certain ambiguities in that act, they were obliged *at times* to have recourse to temporary measures for the purpose of carrying its provisions *fairly* into effect." Yet is it a rule in construing conventions, that in case of ambiguity, the articles shall always be interpreted in favour of the capitulating party. Not so for the Irish at the bar of the House of Commons of the imperial parliament.

[1] These undertakers, being paid, engaged to do the king's business. Such were the Beresfords, Fitzgibbons, Fosters, Castlereaghs: they correspond to what Machiavel calls *famiglie fatali*, who rise by the ruin of their country. p. 92.

But, says Mr. Vansittart, the prætor of the Latins in addressing the fraudulent Romans used *but* differently: —"Nam si etiam sub umbra fœderis æqui, *servitutem* pati possumus, &c."

If the law be broken, promises have been bravely disregarded. The Catholics were to be emancipated; yet, as if the government rejoiced in insulting that vast population, no man is so likely to rise to power as the most furious and lying of their enemies[1]. Instances of this prosperous hate occurred last year. I have in other publications spoken at large on this subject; I shall therefore only say, that, considering the general improvement in thinking, the conduct of the British church and state to the Catholics degrades the British government beneath the Russian, Austrian, and Prussian tyrannies, and sinks it to the low level of the priestridden governments of Portugal and Spain.

What has the union effected for the Protestants, Dissenters, and Catholics—the whole people of Ireland—respecting tithes? Mr. Pitt, when debating the union, said, that the mode of collecting tithes in Ireland was a great practical evil. Has this been reformed? has any show of reform been attempted? The English ministry can force the union, raise an immense debt without the possibility of paying the interest, throng the country with troops, revive the

[1] Mr. Peel, in his speech against the Catholics in 1817, became a representative of an university. In this speech he alluded to a great outrage in the county of Louth, as if the violence had been committed by Catholics against Protestants; yet all were Catholics. If he did not know this, it is part of his usual ignorance; if he did know it, the deception was flagitious.

curfew;—but regulate tithing in Ireland! in this they are powerless,—powerless to do good, their energy being evil.

It has been proved on oath, that two guineas an acre for meadow were demanded and enacted for tithes in Armagh; that forty acres of potatoes in the South[1] were charged five pounds an acre; and that in five counties in one year 1421 decrees were issued against paupers for non-payment of tithes. For the national church of Ireland, that is, Protestant clergymen, exact in proportion to their neglect and their utter useless-ness[2], for those they charge are generally Catholics[3]. No wretch so miserable that they will not pursue in order to seize part of his pittance. In this respect these ghostly men are only to be compared to the Ricaras, a savage tribe in North America, who de-scend to rob the field-mice of their stores.

No good has been done for Ireland; no interest is excited respecting it;—with the loss of its parliament all is lost, even hope; for the chances suggested by desperation come not of hope, but of hope deferred. Had the parliament of Ireland been reformed, and the people been reinstated in their rights and liberties, Ireland would have been a happy, a peaceable, and a powerful ally. But England in fear and envy made

[1] In Cashel. Sir John Newport stated this.

[2] The Bishop of Limerick told Mr. Wakefield, (State of Ireland,) "that there were parishes in his diocese which had never seen a Protestant clergyman."

[3] In some parishes there is not one Protestant. Sir J. Blaquiere (Feb. 20, 1792) said in the House of Commons, that in the parish where he resided there were fifteen thousand Catholics, and he himself the only Protestant.

it a servant—a servant of servants; and she must enjoy the consequence: "Inter dominum et servum nulla amicitia—etiam in pace belli tamen jura serventur[1]." Twenty-five thousand troops in Ireland justify the remark. The evil of the connexion is increased to Ireland by the union in a thousand ways, and by none so much as by the numerous absentees—an evil recognised in Richard the Third's reign[2], and which induced him to publish an ordinance against absentees from Ireland. This evil occasioned Mr. Flood to propose a measure to the same purpose in the beginning of the present reign, to which Lord North seems to have acceded; and lately Mr. Peel and Mr. Fitzgerald had similar projects. The want of resident proprietors has rendered the West India islands of England inferior to the French[3]; and this want, which has acted against Ireland in the remotest periods, has increased by every violation of humanity and justice in this ill-fated land. Thus of 511,456 acres which escheated at once to the crown, 209,800 were bestowed on Londoners. The union has multiplied this mischief a thousand-fold. Though some lament that Ireland has not her share in the members of the imperial parliament[4], having less than a fifth in the

[1] Q. Curtius, lib. 7. c. 8. [2] Davies's State of Ireland, p. 223.

[3] Nine-tenths of the proprietors reside on them, according to Robinet. Dictionnaire de l'Homme d'Etat. Barbadoes is called Little England, because there is a greater proportion of resident proprietors there than in any other sugar-island. Steele and Dickson, p. 441. The twelve principal companies of London are seised of Irish estates in Ulster: James sold them for 60,000*l*. Hume, vol. 6. In Charles the First's reign, also, large tracts were forfeited.

[4] Mr. Newenham shows that Ireland should have had 150 or

Commons though she contains half the population of Britain; yet the more she should gain in equity of representation, the more she must lose in her proprietary population. Thus a larger representation would increase the mischief—so fundamentally pernicious is that measure. Yet all *loyal* Irishmen are bound to bless the union, and their glorious constitution in church and state! this union, which has not left them what the paltriest West Indian colony enjoys—a resident legislature; and which was preserved to the Isle of Man, for the Manx have their Tynwald still: yet Ireland has been thought unworthy of a minor session. Excellent Irish constitution! which requires strangers to direct the national affairs; and who, being collated to the ministry in Ireland, are then re-exported to attend to parliamentary affairs at London. A wonderful constitution! consisting of alien ministers and refugee legislators!

The loss by absentees to Ireland, in exhausting the sources of its prosperity, is enormous. When Arthur Young wrote his Tour in Ireland [1], he enumerated the absentees, and calculated the amount of their income, which they drew from Ireland, at 732,700*l.* a year. Different writers on the currency of Ireland in 1804, estimated it at 2,000,000[2]:—such was the evidence of Messrs. Paget and Bainbridge. Lord Lauderdale, in 1805, supposed that Ireland paid to her absentees

170 representatives. Scotland was better treated in forming her partnership. Laing's History, vol. 4. p. 330.

[1] vol. 2. p. 193.

[2] Mr. Wakefield calculated it generally between two and three millions in his elaborate work on Ireland.

2,890,000*l.*, exclusive of 1,500,000*l.* as interest on the money borrowed in England: for the last twelve years, in war and peace, the debt, the interest, and the draught by absentees, have fearfully increased the amount of her debt: I need not calculate it, for it can never be liquidated. Mark the loss to Ireland by her absentees only:—Estimate it at three millions, or less, annually for the last twenty-four years; this sum transferred to England, for which nothing is given, and nothing returned,—not even an imperial promissory note,—nearly equals all the subsidies granted by Britain during the war to the voracious allies. Yet these subsidies are supposed to have deranged the currency of opulent England, and some main branches of her industry. Yet England only lost what she had obtained gratuitously from Ireland: to her it was the loss of a gain; while to Ireland it was an entire loss, a perpetual loss; for it continues through all vicissitudes of domestic outrage, foreign war, and general tranquillity:—besides, three millions to Ireland equal thirty millions to Great Britain.

To this wholesale impoverishment by absentees, originating in the first outrageous connexion between the two islands, augmented by escheats and forfeitures, and by the last and greatest penalty—the forfeiture of the legislature; we must add the ruinous consequences of the monstrous disjunction of men from their property, extending in infinite detail. The absentee has an agent, who, as the price of a lease, receives a bribe equivalent to a fine. The tenants are frequently middlemen, who reset the land; as they have been squeezed, they, in their turn, crush their cotters. I know nothing like the Irish middleman: he does not resemble

the American land-jobber, who is in some degree a retail dealer; nor the forestaller, who often relieves the seller by affording him a prompt market, and who gains little more than what his time and the use of his capital deserve; nor like the middlemen, who deal in slaves in the West Indies[1]. Tytler indeed compares Indian middlemen to them: they rent so much, and set this in portions at a rack-rent[2]. A writer in the Edinburgh Review[3] doubts if they are injurious; yet conduct similar to theirs in Ireland, was noticed by the Scotch proprietors, and remedied. Stair says, "Rentals do ordinarily contain a clause not to subset, assign, or analyse; which if it be contravened, not only the assignation or substraction is void, but the rental itself[4]." This subinfeudation of tenants comes by deputation from proprietors who are absentees; for no one could witness his land and those who reside on it abused together, and not prevent its recurrence. Let it not be supposed, however, that the oppression of the terre-tenant proceeds entirely from middlemen: this misery is of long-standing. In Spenser's time, a lease was considered a sort of bondage[5].

[1] These are reputed very pernicious, and resolutions have been passed to prevent the practice.

[2] At something more;—rack-rent is defined the full yearly value let by lease. Law Dict. vol. 2. p. 573. [3] No. for July, 1813.

[4] Stair's Institutions, &c. p. 317.

[5] "The poor husbandman either dare not bind himself to him for a longer term, or thinketh, by his continual liberty of change, to keep his landlord the rather in awe from wringing him." State of Ireland, p. 133. The same is now the case in the Zetland Islands. Edmonton says, There are few leases; the tenants seem to entertain as much repugnance to leases as the landlords, c. 7. Mr. Malthus, vol. 1. p. 489, has noticed, from the Statistical Ac-

To set at rack-rent is not unknown to proprietors. I have heard from a gentleman of the south of Ireland, that many of his cast esteem a *rise of rent equal to two manurings*. So that the English writers and talkers, who think that all the misery of Ireland proceeds from the idleness of the people,—and this from the coarseness of their living,—may learn that the life of an Irishman is not a continued holiday of indolence and relaxation.

Let then those who arraign the Irish people, recall their slanders, and Mr. Malthus chiefly; and let them direct their vengeance against the causes of the afflictions of Ireland. Does he not himself say, that the indigence, which is hopeless, destroys all vigorous exertions, and confines all efforts to the attainment of a bare existence? Whence then his abhorrence of the Irish?—that *they breed like beasts;* and his disgust at their mud-cabbins and rags, expressed like that popinjay, who railed because a dead body was brought between the wind and his nobility. The Irish are taxed *de haut et de bas*; they are taxed infinitely more than when Clarendon was viceroy, who dared say "the poor are miserably harassed that a few may gain." For, besides the sums which, having entered the exchequer, issue in a thousand polluted channels,—how miserably are they taxed by the agents of absentees, those farm-

count of Scotland, that in Bressay, Burra, and Quarff in Shetland, "the young are encouraged to marry young: the consequence is poverty and distress." Yet in the same paragraph, he says, "They fish for their masters, who either give them a fee totally inadequate, or take their fish at a low rate." He might as well say they were robbed, because they married: tyranny and oppression of this kind are quite sufficient to keep Scotch or Irish poor.

ers-general of the rental of Ireland! and by middlemen—creatures, half fly and half reptile, between the locust and the mole!—then the protestant clergyman and the tithe proctor, who would have been without similitude, in reality or fancy, had not Milton allegorized Sin and Death. Yet these things are perpetually acted; and the people are called turbulent, idle, ignorant, beastly breeders:—yet against the government and superior orders nothing transpires—

.....omnis
Turba tacet, nec causidicus nec præco loquitur [1].

Nay, the provincial government is praised and the imperial greatly eulogized, though it has imposed a military police yeomen and a standing army of 20,000, and is bankrupt to more than the amount of the whole national debt[2]: but England has adopted Ireland's insolvency. How could she do otherwise?—and she passed the intercourse act in admitting the import of Irish grain into England. Wonderful! Then must we honour the 14 Geo. II., by which Ireland was permitted, in time of dearth, to send victuals to Scotland. England accepted grain from Ireland when England want-

[1] Juvenal, sat. 6. ver. 437.

[2] Sir W. Petty said, "England hath constantly lost these 500 years, by their [her] meddling with Ireland." Polit. Anatomy, p. 28. This is certain, that by taxing Ireland far beyond her power, England has reduced Ireland's efficiency in various ways. Taxes paid into the exchequer in 1815, 5,750,000*l*; in 1816, 4,540,000*l*. Bushels of malt, which paid duty in 1815, 670,000; in 1816, 480,000. Duties on tea, 1815, 576,000*l*.; 1816, 443,000*l*. Total revenue this year, 4,338,000*l*.; current expense 4,865,000*l*. Thus 427,000*l*. added to 6,500,000*l*. interest on the debt, exhibit the amount of Ireland's insolvency and burthen to England by the Union.

ed provisions ;—Prodigious kindness ! If England resisted the import of Irish grain, how were the increasing absentees to receive their rents, and how was Ireland to contribute to the war of the monarchy? The English wanted money—Ireland had none ; but she had grain, which was, in fact, the war[1] contribution of Ireland : it was the conversion price, which the vassal paid his lord when summoned to battle.

The productiveness of Ireland is immense. In 1808-9-10, the grain exported from Ireland amounted to 2,170,000 quarters ; in 1814, Ireland exported nearly three millions worth of grain, the greater part of which passed to Great Britain. The average annual export of butter from Ireland during 1812-13-14-15, was 440,000 cwts., value *5l.* 10*s.* per cwt. The export of beef and pork is equally extensive. In short, Ireland exported eight millions of agricultural produce, the greater part of which was not given in barter, but sent to absentees, or paid as the war contribution, &c.; and this was absolutely lost to Ireland without any return. Yet the Irish peasant is to be abused because he is poor :—Who makes him so?

> " The swain, with tears, his frustrate labour yields,
> And famish'd, dies amidst his ripen'd fields."

He is idle, forsooth. Labour is said to have been imposed on man as a punishment; but the revilers of the Irish must consider labour a luxury. Why should

[1] This kindness of Great Britain resembles the boast of Lord Harcourt in his speech to the Irish parliament, October 1775. " The act which allows the clothing and accoutrements necessary for his majesty's forces, paid from the revenues of this kingdom, to be exported from Ireland, is a particular mark of the royal favour."

the Irish be industrious, who will not receive the profit of their industry? Yet the Irish toil and struggle; and under every political and civil disadvantage they raise food for six millions of people at home, and a vast surplus produce for strangers. It is said that Ireland is overpeopled, and that this proceeds from the beastly propensities of the people to generate. There are many wretchedly poor in Ireland, but I deny that this misery is of the people's making; for the produce of the land and labour of Ireland is transferred from the Irish to others: nay, that which remains is still further perverted by the monstrous injustice of the ruling orders. The domestic state of Ireland, in this respect, resembles an account by Howard[1], "Certain keepers of Bridewell, who farmed what little food was allowed the prisoners, and who engaged to furnish each prisoner with two penny-worth of bread a day; I have known that shrink to one half." And yet the Irish, and not the government,—those who tax and tithe and carry away and waste and plunder,—are to be slandered by a host of men, who take the tone of vituperation from Mr. Malthus. "Are ye such fools, ye sons of Israel, that without examination, or knowledge of the truth, ye have condemned a daughter of Israel!" Yet these, without knowledge or examination, condemn a whole nation.

If any could be gratified by vengeance on such senseless declaimers, a review of their remedies for the excessive populousness of Ireland would amply gratify that passion. Feed them on the dearer food; on grain instead of potatoes—stimulate exertions—create new

[1] On Prisons, sect. 1. p. 4.

wants [1]—implant new tastes. As if the Irish, by choice, were of the school of Diogenes. How little do such men know of human nature! The same objections have been habitually made to the Russians; yet Dr. Clarke, who has no predilection for that people, says of them, "With regard to the idleness of the lower classes here (Russia), of which we have heard great complaints, it appears that where they have an interest in exertion, they by no means want industry, and have just the same wish for luxuries as other people." Suppose the population of Ireland had as many wants as the Sybarites—how are they to relieve them in their present circumstances? Away with sick men's dreams! Give them a better government, a self-government: let the people enjoy the fruits of their labours; their disposition to enjoy all comforts is as certain as their senses. Create new wants! Try the experiment on Tantalus; and when you have succeeded in redeeming him from misery, you will have one proof, at least, for the potency of your charm.

Mr. Malthus and others seem to think, that by exciting new desires, and feeding the Irish on the dearer grain, the numbers of the Irish will be diminished, and their wages will rise (which Mr. Ricardo deprecates). But the people were not more comfortable when they were fewer than they are now [2]. The Irish

[1] This is not new; for bishop Berkeley, among his queries, "whether the bulk of our natives are not kept from thriving by a cynical content in dirt and beggary."

[2] Sir William Temple repeatedly complains of *scarcity of people* in Ireland, vol. 1. p. 6. Again he says, "The want of trade in Ireland proceeds from want of people." vol. 1. p. 110.

are now just as the Gauls [1] were when they suffered servitude; and their distresses continued their oppression.

I have now exhibited in a rapid view the state of the population of Ireland, and have endeavoured to show the true causes of the misery of the people, which does not arise from their numbers or their idleness, but from the circumstances, civil, political, and sectarian, to which they are subjected; and this inquiry, while it relieves a large portion of mankind from unmerited obloquy, preserves the simplicity of truth, promotes the science of government, and the comforts of society. The Irish are numerous and miserable; but they are not miserable because they are numerous; for six would be as wretched under the same misrule as six thousand, or six hundred thousand. It is utterly absurd to imagine, that because many have little, if they were reduced to few, those remaining must enjoy abundance; for this supposes that the poor must perish and the rich survive. Pursue this scheme, and I admit that having narrowed the population of the world to a few families, each individual would be kindred to a king; and by a further reduction, Adam and Eve might be restored to Paradise, of which there is a remote resemblance in England. I quote the passage for the benefit of those who favour a population of original exility. "It (the parish of Twiford near Harrow) contains only one house; the

[1] Plerique, quum aut ære alieno, aut magnitudine tributorum, aut injuria potentiorum premuntur, sese in servitutem dicant nobilibus. In hos eadem omnia sunt jura quæ dominis in seryos. Cæsar de Bel. Gall. lib. 6. c. 13.

farmer who occupies it is perpetual churchwarden of a church which has no incumbent, and in which no duty is performed." The account concludes, "an overseer of the poor is unnecessary."

By this review I wish to inculcate that Ireland is not overpeopled, but undergoverned; that the evils under which the country labours are referable to its military subjection and military possession; to the perpetual politics of the British ministry in Ireland, creating dissension and mistrust among the natives, and thus humiliating all through their passions and their misery, which is continued by the existing army in Ireland; by the degradation of the Catholics; by the immense tyranny of the law officers in prosecuting for libels; and the peculiarly flagitious law under which they prosecute the object of their hate, by attainting all independent principles and liberal inquiry, in which crusade Provost Elrington [1] is as ardent as Attorney-General Saurin. Yet Lord Liver-

[1] Dr. James Wood has done as much for Cambridge; but this was in consequence of the bills passed in 1817 against freedom. Dr. Elrington anticipated, prophetically, the authentic will of ministers. First he obstructed the meeting of the Historical Society, in which the students debated: having regulated and abridged, he finally abolished it. He also proposed that Locke on Government should be read in the *Course*, with his precious notes—the students were satisfied with the text. Then the *Board*, by and with the advice of the annotator, dismissed Locke on Government, and substituted Butler's Analogy, which, beside the baseness of the attempt, shows how incompetent a junta of priests are to educate citizens. Such is the fate of Locke!—banished when a student from the University of Oxford, and now banished as an author from the University of Dublin. The harmony of Universities!!

pool and the like talk of educating the people, when the means of knowledge and the benefits of education to the higher classes of society are negatived or perverted by the officers of the crown and the heads of the universities. The evils of Ireland are referable also to strange ministers and a foreign legislature; to a taxation, which having swept away the capital of the country, has fallen into an abyss of unparalleled insolvency; to the flood of wealth to absentees, which never ebbs or stops, but flows on with an increasing tide:—to the pillage of the people by middlemen, and tithe proctors and clergymen. The Irish are called free; yet the serfs and boors of Hungary [1] (an appendant country like Ireland) do not pay altogether more than what the Catholics of Ireland pay to the Protestant clergy. Yet we are told, that morally to reform the Irish we must feed them on grain. We must give them new tastes—we must educate them [2]. They know their wrongs; to advance their

[1] Townson says, that the peasants of Hungary pay the ninths of their produce, which with duty days may amount to about our tithes. Travels in Hungary, p. 115–131.

[2] The Irish are as well educated as most people, better generally than the English. Formerly the ministerial cant was *the great benefit to be derived from charter schools*, which were literally depôts where Catholic children were charitably apostatized. Every Lord Lieutenant's speech, time immemorial, was seasoned with recommending them to parliament. In 1770 a tax on hawkers and pedlars was appropriated to their support; and they receive an annual grant of 40,000*l*. Now *these great sources of industry, virtue, and true religion* (Speech in 1767), are declared nought, while the expense of them continues. But Lord Liverpool, Mr. Peel, and the rest, talk of the diffusion of knowledge and true religion by education,—This must have an end.

knowledge would but inflame them against their enemies. It racks man's frame; it makes his nerves shrink; it fixes aching in his brain, and wears his anatomy, to hear incessantly millions of toiling fellow-men belied and abused—and for what and for whom? But it stuns and stupifies when these things are done, and not one raises his voice in the defence of the oppressed. I know the theme is ungrateful, and he that utters it adopts the load and odium he would relieve. "Let not the reverence of any man cause thy fall; and refrain not to speak when there is occasion to do good." Others fear to speak the truth—I should fear to be silent. Indeed, few think more of Ireland than of the dead. The public mind is lost in dismay or indignation, while busy *gentlemen* are selfish and sordid; or if a few be moved to better things, they are banded in some puny association—a horticultural society, which distributes prizes for best grapes and best gooseberries; or which under the style and title of Royal Academy, or Dublin Society, trifle so anxiously and so absurdly. The only public feeling that has been lately expressed, regards a tax on windows. Thus the voltaic battery twitches the eye or ear or lip of a thing no more. Your legislature was wrung from you, and all its accompanying consolations, and now you bluster about a window-tax.—"Ita sunt stulti ut amissa republica piscinas suas fore salvas sperare videantur."

CHAPTER VI.

No free nation distressed by excess of people.—Ill-governed nations distressed, whether having few or many people.—Population declining and misery increasing with the viciousness of the government;—and the reverse—population increasing and comfort with liberty.—Examples—Egypt—Crete—Rhodes—Cyprus—Sparta—Athens—Italy.

THOUGH I do not say that no free nation can become too populous, I presume that when the government is essentially vicious, the cause of the people's misery is more decisively referable in the first instance to the badness of the government than to the improvidence of the people. This is strictly just; for we know that nations formerly poor and thinly inhabited, have with a better government increased in numbers and comforts; and, on the contrary, that nations populous and opulent, have with the debasement of their laws and constitution, declined not more in people than in their enjoyments of life. Yet am I ignorant of any nation, which possessing confirmed liberty and equal laws, has become miserable merely by the excess of its people.

These positions are proved by the whole stream of history; first, by Egypt, which was so populous and has always been so productive. Herodotus[1] says of it, that "until the reign of Rhampsinitus, Egypt was remarkable for its *abundance* and *excellent law*;" but that under his successors all things were altered, and the people were grievously oppressed by toil and tyranny. Still the people were numerous; for the go-

[1] lib. 2. c. 124.

vernment, with all its evils, continued to be Egyptian. It became a Roman province :—the people declined ; enmity and jealousy were infused among the Egyptians, and they continued to be diminished by the greater provincial misrule, down to the present time. Those people who ate much flesh-meat in the time of Moses [1], who were so dainty in the time of Herodotus [2] that they despised barley and wheat as food, afterwards were satisfied [3] with bread and beer ; while now, those who reside in the territories of Adowa and Tchagassa, with their triple harvests [4], scarcely support a poor and dispersed people. The people have uniformly declined with their oppressions—with the increased viciousness of the government ; and that country which was a refuge to the miserable of other nations, which alone of all Europe escaped famine in the time of Polybius [5], could not latterly support its own diminished population, as in 1784 and 1785 the towns of Syria and the neighbouring countries were filled with famishing [6] Egyptians. Such are the concomitants of a people falling from equal laws, if Theocritus be an authority for the ancient state of Egypt, to provincial subjection, till at present Egypt is literally the servant of servants, Mameluke [7] signifying a military slave.

Sicily exhibits the same eventful tale. When the

[1] Dion Cassius, lib. 71. c. 4. [2] lib. 2. c. 36.
[3] Athenæus, lib. 10. p. 418. [4] Bruce, vol. 3. c. 7.
[5] Excerpt. c. 2.
[6] Volney's Voyage en Syrie, t. 1. p. 173.
[7] Ibid. t. 1. p. 90. These slaves, Mr. Legh says, took Ibrim : "The population was partly carried off by the Mamelukes, and partly removed to Dehr.".

Athenians enjoyed the greatest power and opulence, a small portion of this island resisted an invading army of 60,000 men attended by a mighty fleet. Then the cities of Sicily were free, and a number of them cemented their common strength by a representative assembly [1]. After this, it fell under the dominion of Rome. At first the Romans ruled humanely. Cicero [2] says, Sicily was eminently favoured by enjoying the use of its own laws. Cato called Sicily the *cella penaria* of Rome; and Cicero, to the same purpose, "hac alimur ac sustinemur [3]." Rome, however, from the beginning enacted corn laws, and the Sicilians were not permitted to export grain to any power except by a license from Rome, which they granted to the Rhodians and other Greeks on their application [4]. As the Roman government sunk at home, it fell abroad: slavery was extended in Sicily, and the slaves were most abused. They were chained while they worked [5]; prisons for refractory slaves were frequent:—thence the Servile war began, and it continued till 60,000 men formed the insurrectionary force. Verres [6] assisted the depopulation of the island by his tyranny; and thus Sicily [7], even the

[1] Οι αλλοι Σικελιωται ζυνελθοντες ες γελαν απο πασων των πολεων πρεσβεις, &c. Thucydides, lib. 4. p. 289. Some suppose that representation is a modern invention; it was known to the ancients in every possible way. See "Nat. Government." I could add to the account in that work various authorities.

[2] t. 2. p. 121. [3] Ibid. p. 89. [4] Polybius, Excerpt. 73.

[5] Hic ad cultum agri frequentia ergastula catenatique cultores, materiam bello præbuere. Florus, lib. 3. c. 19.

[6] Siciliam provinciam C. Verres per triennium depopulatus esse, t. 2. p. 47.

[7] Ibid. p. 126.

Etnean part, which was most fertile, was rendered incult and unprofitable. After this, the island was subjected to Saracens and Normans and Spaniards; under the last, the inhabitants of Messina [1] were excluded from all employments civil and military, even of being enrolled as common soldiers. Sicily latterly became an appendage to Naples. It may be remarked, in passing, that England, while it purchased the destruction of the parliament of Ireland by artifice, power, and subsidies, restored a parliament [2] to Sicily: and thus while it sunk Ireland to provincial vassalage, it effectually raised Sicily to a state-companion [3]. But the king of Naples on his restoration rather followed the example of England to Ireland, than England's missionary politics in Sicily. Sicily has now lost her parliament guarantied by England, and she submits to the transmarine government of Ferdinand the Fourth, probably the worst sovereign that she ever experienced. The whole population of the island about the middle of the last century was not more, according to Amico, than 1,093,163; of

[1] Van Egmont's Travels, vol. 1. p. 60.

[2] The English wished to give the Sicilians the British constitution:—for the English suppose it must suit all people. Thus Mr. Campbell the missionary gave the Griquaas, the descendants of Griqua, a code founded on the English constitution. All the grand deeds of British legislation in Sicily are overborne. Thus, after having supported the Sicilian government by a subsidy of 300,000*l.* annually from 1805, and having expended a million and a half annually to support their army, we have restored legitimacy, and thus undid the constitution that we guarantied.

[3] As was said on another occasion, La signoria che noi concedemmo gia a i reali de Napoli fu compagnia, et non servitu. Machiavel Storia, p. 73.

which the religious orders were a thirteenth. The people are enormously oppressed, paying nearly all the ordinary and extraordinary contributions, the nobility and clergy contributing only an eighteenth. Large sums are raised every year for roads, which are never repaired [1]. Sicily has *corn-laws* and a corn-company[2]. The Sicilian landholder consigns his farm to his steward, as in Spain[3]; where the stewards of great estates cultivate them on their master's account.

Thence depopulation and poverty are spread in every direction: Mr. Vaughan speaks of tracts "to the extent of ten miles, containing neither farmers nor inhabitants." "Nothing," says Mr. Thompson, "is seen in Sicily but misery and oppression; on all sides a government sunk into the last stage of weakness." No matter in what direction, the country is desert and the people wretched: even Scolietta[4], which has a considerable trade, consists of a miserable collection of huts. Every thing declines:—sugar, which some time since was much cultivated in Sicily, is now confined to a small spot near Avola. Such is the consequence of bad government; with the finest climate, the most commercial situation, amidst a sea abounding in fish, possessing the most productive soil, which fed a numerous population, and supplied even in its provincial abasement, Rome[5], and the Archipelago, and Greece; Sicily, the abode of Ceres and Bacchus, has not now

[1] Cockburn's Voyage, vol. 2. p. 26. [2] Ibid, p. 228.
[3] Travels, vol. 2. p. 25.
[4] General Cockburn cannot account for this, vol. 2. p. 81. Yet the reason is obvious. [5] Cicero, t. 2. p. 148.

one-tenth[1] of its most fertile soil in tillage; and in 1812 it actually imported wheat to the amount of nearly a million of dollars. Such is the state of Sicily under Ferdinand, who, according to the *classical*[2] Mr. Eustace, possesses a happy royal medium understanding fittest for governing nations. Sicily, which boasted Syracuse, invented comedy and tragedy[3], educated Archimedes, which expelled the Carthaginians, repulsed confederated Greece,—is now without opulence or authority or people, except a few peasants who have survived to testify against king, barons, and clergy, for freedom and their fathers[4]. Here then are two nations which declined in people and their comforts in proportion to the degradation of their government; and these instances embrace a period, or rather a series of periods, co-extensive with the range of history. It is a common consequence: such has been the fate of Crete, called the *happy island* (μα-

[1] Vaughan, p. 316.

[2] This prosing author, though admired by our critics, says of this same monarch, that he observed in conversation, "All the world were Turks before the birth of our Saviour." This Ferdinand is the choice one of his father; his elder brother being set aside for idiocy. Mr. Eustace would be thought a great admirer of ancient literature. Hume says, that passionate admirers of the ancients are zealous partisans of civil liberty. Essays, vol. 1. t. 401.

[3] Plato. Minos. p. 569.

[4] Mr. Blaquiere speaks with horror of the higher orders, the *Corinthian capitals.* General Cockburn praises the *people* frequently. "The lower orders are by far the best, and naturally a fine people ruined by their government and their priests." vol. 2. p. 97. "In sixteen voyages with them, I have found them faithful, sober, scrupulously honest, and obliging." p. 74.

καρονησος), the parent of laws, navigation, and literature[1],—of Rhodes, of Cyprus, which according to Olivier does not now contain 60,000 persons; and mark that here the people have declined most in number, and here the people are most miserable[2] while in Thessaly, where the population has suffered the least, the people are the least wretched.

As the people disappear by bad government, so they re-assemble with the improvement of their laws and a reform of their constitution. Such effects are imputed to the laws of Lycurgus, and the establishment of the ephori; but as the government became deteriorated, and luxury and treachery and tyranny were manifest, the people declined[3]. Thence the loss at Leuctra was irreparable[4]. For it was not the destruction of many citizens in that battle which could not be recruited; they were estimated only at one thousand by Plutarch[5], and Aristotle says Laconia could support 1,500 horse and 30,000 foot[6]. The Spartans had supported great

[1] Strabo says, that Minos made the liberty of the subject the object of all his institutions. lib. 10. p. 480. Polyhistor. lib. 1. c. 17. It appears that Jupiter did for Crete (Aristot. t. 1. p. 1157.) what St. Patrick did for Ireland.

[2] Thornton's Turkish Empire, p. 19.

[3] There is a theatrical account of the abstinence of Pausanias after the battle of Platæa, Herod. lib. 9. c. 82. but he soon declined into the Asiatic taste. When he ceased simplicity, he betrayed his country to the great king. Thucydides, lib. i. p. 85.

[4] They governed unjustly:—thus, says Cicero, all their allies deserted them. t. 4. p. 377.

[5] In Agesil. Vitam.

[6] De Politicis, lib. 2. This is not the whole population. At Platæa there were five thousand Spartans, and each was accompanied with seven armed helotes. Herod. lib. 9. c. 10.

wars, and they had frequently restored their ranks either by citizens, or by raising helotes to freedom[1]: but they had lost with the debasement of their institutions their indomitable spirit. Thucydides mentions the submission of the besieged Spartans at Sphacteria, though reduced from 420 to 292, as the most extraordinary event of that eventful war[2]: for it was imagined by all the Grecians, that they would never be taken alive. Thus public spirit and institutions declined together under the generalship of Pausanias, the royalty of Cleomenes, and the despotism of Nabis; those people, says Polybius, submitted to the tyrant Nabis, who formerly could not brook even the name of tyranny[3].

Athens and Greece exhibited the harmony between liberty and population, between a vicious government and a waning people; and the flood of life rose or fell according to the fluctuations of freedom or slavery. When, says Herodotus[4], the Athenians were subject to tyrants, (Mr. Mitford's much injured men,) they were not superior to their neighbours; but with freedom, when each man exercised his talents on his own account, they stood chief among mankind. How could it be otherwise? Their oath of allegiance was not to Pisistratus, for they execrated kings, but to their country, which they swore to leave better and greater than they found it[5]. And they were true to their promise, for their constitution was a democracy. "It is called a democracy," says Pericles, "because it regards not the profit of the few but of the

[1] Thucydides, lib. 7. p. 501. [2] lib. 4. [3] lib. 4. c. 81.
[4] lib. 5. c. 78. [5] Apud Stobæum, sermo 41. p. 243.

many[1]." The Athenian constitution held principles directly opposed to the British: for Xenophon says[2], The people deservedly have more power than the nobles and the rich, because the people support the navy and the state. At this time the people increased in number and enjoyments. They increased in *men*, —not as Mr. Malthus counts them, animals who live to eat,—but men who have left eternal monuments of their taste and genius. The democracy was displaced, and oligarchy substituted; and assassination, chiefly managed by the young men of the *best families*, confirmed the short reign of the thirty tyrants[3]. How they must have reduced the population we may conjecture, as the treaty with Antipater[4] (which deprived all those who had not two thousand drachmæ of the civil government) expatriated indignantly two-thirds of the Athenians. Affairs were reinstated, liberty restored, the people returned, and the genius of Pericles revived, in the eloquence of Demosthenes. But the Athenian republic had suffered too many and too great shocks quickly repeated to cope with Philip's power. Thus the Athenians, who commanded a force,

[1] Thucydides, lib. 2. p. 123. [2] De Rep. Athen. p. 691.

[3] Mitford says, "The means by which the oligarchical party in Athens itself had in the meantime advanced far in their purpose, do no honour either to the Athenian government or the Athenian character. The principal was assassination, and it seems to have been chiefly managed by the young men of the best families," &c. c. 19. s. 5. It is no attaint to the Athenian character that the aristocrats were assassins; for it is a common consequence that his *best* families should be the worst, at Athens as elsewhere.

[4] Plutarch, Antipater, Diodorus Siculus.

even after their defeat at Syracuse, of 40,000 combatants[1], could oppose Philip's domination with 2,000 men[2], 500 only of which were Athenians. Why Greece, which opposed the Persians with 150,000 men when Greece was free, could not raise in Plutarch's time 3,000 men[3]; a number which one city, Megara, sent to the battle of Platæa.

Modern reports also accord with ancient story. In the wreck of Italy—where all means failed to preserve the population; where slaves and freemen declined together; where the finest tracts, even Campania, the paradise of the world[4], became desert; where neither absence from tribute[5], nor the grant in propriety of waste lands, with many favours to those who should reclaim them[6], (a circumstance unhappily intelligible to the English of the present time[7],) could redeem

[1] Thucydides, lib. 7. p. 548.

[2] Truly this is the whole amount, with a few horse that Demosthenes proposed raising. First Philippic. Philip was a tolerable master: he would not garrison Athens, saying to his captains who advised him, Ὑπερ δοξης παντα ποιουντα και πασχοντα. Plutarch. Moral. p. 107.

[3] Moral. p. 186.

[4] Omnium non modo Italiæ sed toto orbe terrarum pulcherrima plaga est. Florus, lib. 1. c. 16. It was pestilential when Condamine travelled; it is so now, and must continue so under its present management.

[5] Three hundred and thirty thousand acres had been exempted from tribute. Gibbon, vol. 2. p. 65.

[6] As, to be ten years free from tribute and from all public avocations. Herodian, lib. 2. p. 92.

[7] The Duke of Bedford in 1816 stated, that he knew two farms in Norfolk, one of 5,000 and another of 3,000 acres, which had

from sterility;—the casual return of a free government, a self-government, though beset with mighty enemies, and obliged to incorporate the remains of a Gothic nobility, multiplied at once men and all things: all which sunk when the republics merged into principalities. Such was the state of Tuscany. Again: They arose from their misery with returning freedom. Capriata dwells on the exhausted state of Genoa, and on its restoration; on its liberty, and with liberty the increase of people, and their activity and opulence [1]. Van Egmont [2] also contrasts the debased state of Tuscany, and the sudden and ravishing change on passing from Tuscany into the republic of Lucca; which felicitous appearance he again saw contrasted with Pistoia, which had lost its liberty and its people.

been offered to any one who would cultivate them, rent free; and that the offer was not accepted.

[1] Storia di Genoa, p. 632. [2] Travels, vol. 1. p. 29.

PART III.

CHAPTER I.

Various considerations respecting what should determine the meaning of Populousness—or the contrary—as different states of society—situation — climate—soil—unhealthiness—salubrity—aridity— commodities — customary food—habits — intemperance—abstemiousness—luxury—government.

HAVING reviewed the state of population in different countries and in dissimilar situations, I conclude that neither the populousness of a nation nor the paucity of its inhabitants is alarming. It is bad government and unequal laws and disproportioned property that are dreadful;—these render the few and the many miserable: while a nation well governed, or rather not misgoverned, increases in people, and enlarges their store and their comforts. Thus the United Provinces when they spurned the domination of Spain,—thus the American provinces on their emancipation from Britain,—increased in numbers, opulence, and authority. I also deny that any country in Europe is overpeopled, though Mr. Malthus states the reverse; and I am persuaded, on re-examination, few will believe that the misery of Europe proceeds from superfœtation, but from the rapacity and extravagance of the ruling orders.

The *principle of population*, and all the devils which

a partial, unpopular, and hypochondriacal view saw emerging with the children of mankind, do not affright me. Men are surely as much the produce of the earth as the luxuriant crop and the folded sheep; and a populous country is as interesting as the plains of Poland or the pasturing districts of Spain. Perhaps we should consider the import of a populous state; some having calculated the square leagues and their inhabitants, pronounce such a state populous, and such the reverse. These conclusions are drawn from the narrowest premises; for the amount of the superficies of a country is probably the least interesting among a hundred particulars respecting the populousness of a country.

Speaking, then, of populousness or the contrary, we should consider the situation of the people, as savage, pastoral, agricultural, manufacturing, commercial; or how far these combine in forming their habits. Climate is most important. A country so inhospitable as to require a month's labour to procure fuel, —whether it be felling and carrying timber, or cutting and carting peat, or mining coal,—limits the people. A climate of this austerity also requires time to procure heavy or warm clothing, and to raise or sink dwellings;—even a temperate climate often requires much fuel. Dr. John Clarke imputes a large portion of the mortality of children in London to cold and moisture, —suppose the coal enhanced, the mortality would be greater of course.

Some climates have a tendency to disease. Ethiopia has been pestilential from early times: Thucydides says the pestilence of Athens descended from

that country; and Evagrius [1] speaks of another which proceeded from the same region, and wasted Europe for fifty-two years. Some are subjected to insects, which are rather the creatures of climate than of soil, of which locusts seem to be the most desolating: some are afflicted with vermin or poisonous reptiles, or large and voracious beasts. Some countries are subject to noxious winds or hurricanes or earthquakes, which, beside their actual destruction, may affect population through its morality, as this frequently promotes heedlessness or predestination.

As countries are doomed to sterility by a perpetual winter, others suffer by the contrary, and regions of ice are not less inhospitable than the burning desert. In countries so arid that there is no stream, and that wells (the only supply) must be sunk 300 feet, few can live where so much labour is required to procure a drink of water. Countries where the rivers are few or small, or which are absorbed in their course, or spread into marshes, prevent many commodities, and of course affect population. Changing from the line to the pole:—In Lapland, where three or four hundred rein-deer are required for the subsistence of a family, one man may represent a hundred in a favoured region, and perhaps he is less comfortable than the last of a million. Some countries produce scarcely any thing; as that of the Ichthyophagi, who have not altered these 3000 years; still they eat, drink, and live on fish. Some of the Orkneys resemble the shores of the Ichthyophagi [2]; as in them even the

[1] Evagrius Scholasticus, lib. 4. c. 28.

[2] Other people are Ichthyophagi also, as the Laplanders along

sheep and rabbits live on sea-ware. Countries vary in their productiveness in various ways. The Babylonians praised in song the date-tree[1], as affording 360 necessary things. The Indians equally admire the cocoa-nut tree[2]. In the Spice Islands sago[3] affords the people food for three-fourths of the year:—All these vary in the facility of their cultivation and their nutritiousness. Other species of food vary still more in those respects; as rice, potatoes, millet, the plantain. It is computed that an acre of potatoes will produce three times more solid nourishment than an acre of wheat[4]. There is a dispute concerning the respective excellence of the potatoe and rice. Millet is very productive, returning in Switzerland 160 for 1[5]; maize from 50 to 300[6]. The plantain or banana seems to afford the greatest nourishment for man of all the vegetable classes. Humboldt says, the same ground, planted with the plantain, will produce 133 times more food than the same planted with wheat, and 44 times more than the same planted with potatoes[7]. Some say an acre of it will feed fifty persons for a year[8]. Yet the productiveness of the crop

the coast. Leems, c. 7.—Ehrenmalm. Pinkerton, vol. 1. p. 369.
So are the people about Astracan, flesh and bread being so scarce. Ibid. t. 9. p. 387.

[1] Plutarch. Moral. p. 573.

[2] Mrs. Graham says it is the true riches of India. p. 5.

[3] Dampier, vol. 1. p. 4. Pinkerton, &c.

[4] This is A. Smith's calculation. A. Young says four times.

[5] Annual Register, 1765, p. 153.

[6] Monthly Review for January 1812, p. 40.
Essai Politique sur la Nouvelle Espagne, c. 9.

[7] Steele and Dickson: He says also, some reduce the number to seventeen. p. 494.

is not the sole consideration. Millet is easily spoiled in various stages. The banana, in the West Indies, is apt to be overturned, particularly at the equinoxes. Some sorts of food store with difficulty; and others cannot be preserved except for a short time, or for a year; while others may be preserved from year to year, or through a succession of years, without any material injury.

Population is regulated by the habitual food of the people. If there be fish-eaters, there are many more eaters of flesh among men. The Ethiopians lived on flesh[1], and reproached the Persians who ate bread, calling bread dung. So did the Parthians[2] and Celtæ[3], and Usbecks and Turcomans and South Americans[4]. Of the last, Mawe says, "The constant diet of the people, morning, noon, and night, is beef eaten almost always without bread, and frequently without salt."

Some nations are comparatively indifferent what they eat; as the Tartars, Mr. Gray's epicures already mentioned, who feast on the vilest reptiles. The Bosjesman are rejoiced with bread made of pounded locusts. Dampier also speaks of a people living on locusts[5], which, he says, they eat as we do shrimps; and Horneman[6] mentions, that in the Fezzan country locusts, when dried, are esteemed a luxury.

There is also an abstemiousness in nations compared to others in the same state of society, which operates materially on the numbers of the respective

[1] Herodotus, lib. 3. c. 22.
[2] Justin, lib. 41. c. 3.
[3] Athenæus, lib. 4. c. 13. p. 150.
[4] Pinkerton, &c. vol. 9. p. 331.
[5] Ibid. vol. 11. p. 49.
[6] Travels, p. 59. See Niebuhr also, c. 44.

countries. The Bœotians were reproached as great eaters, and of corresponding stupidity[1]; while the Athenians were most mercurial, and ate once, or at most twice a day. The ancient Iberians[2] taxed those who exceeded the measure of their girdle; nor are their descendants less abstemious. Mackinnon mentions, "that the population of Portugal is immense, compared to its cultivation;—they live on little; one third of the number of Britons would starve on such slender means of support."

The English have been long remarked for their Bœotian propensities. "To cram like an Englishman" was a simile in the time of Erasmus. And Shakespeare makes Macbeth say, "Then fly, false Thanes, and mingle with the English epicures." The English preserve the same character; it has been remarked, that what are called necessaries in England are esteemed in Sweden as inducing plethora and inflammation. Thence it happens, partly, that the English do not advance in proportion to their opportunities; while the Scotch, though less favourably situated in many respects, having more thrift and being sparer feeders, preserve nearly their relative population; and that Ireland, amidst all its horrors and afflictions, advances on the numbers of its masters; for though the Irish, like the Jews in Egypt, the more they afflicted them they multiplied and grew[3], exhibit

[1] Plutarch. Moral. p. 364. This eating had much more effect than the climate. The thick atmosphere and stupidity of Bœotia and its people are referable to their full feeding. The Milanese are remarkable among the Italians for eating, and are called *lupi Lombardi*.

[2] Apud Stobæum, sermo 5. p. 74.

[3] Exod. chap. 1.

nothing miraculous in their increase,—the climate is good, the land productive, and potatoes are congenial to soil, climate, and people, while affliction has been to the people a course of philosophy. Misgovernment, which diminished their comforts, imposed on them a rigid parsimony, which has eventually supported their numbers; or rather, these circumstances have enabled them to exceed the rate of increase among the British:—Nay more, these circumstances in a great degree have assisted the Catholic Irish[1] to advance on the Protestant Irish, though the Protestants possessed every advantage, for the Catholics obtained in effect merely the leavings of the English settlers and of their orthodox associates;—the property of the Irish or Catholics was confiscated, their industry and persons persecuted, and all public emoluments of every kind were conferred on strangers or enemies.

Temperance in drinking makes the greatest difference in the population of different kingdoms. I do not singly speak of besotted habits and dram-drinking, which are so notoriously injurious to savages, and to the young men in St. Petersburg, and to the mothers and infant children in London, and to the colonists in New South Wales, but to the unnecessary use of various liquors[2]. Fondness or abhorrence of

[1] Plunket said that in the whole province of Ulster the Catholics, men, women, and children, did not amount to 70,000. State Trials, vol. 3. p. 353. Not long since there was not a Catholic in Belfast;—there are now 4,000. The same is said of Derry.

[2] It appears that Governor Bligh's suppression of the barter of spirits occasioned the mutiny which deposed him.

ardent spirits distinguishes the same people. Thus Park speaks of "Kafirs and Soonakies, i. e. men who drink strong waters." The loss to population is considerable, independent of the demoralizing enfeebling effects of excessive drinking, by the waste of subsistence and labour that attends generally this habit. The religion of Mahomet then, so far as it prohibits the use of wine and spirits, tends to increase the number of the people, however destructive it is in other respects to population.

Besides these circumstances, luxurious propensities are most ruinous: "it consumes its means, and eventually itself." The destruction of human life by luxury is faintly evinced by the Roman who fed his fish with slaves: thousands of men are destroyed in the most senseless pursuits of fashion. How many individuals die, or are rendered infirm and diseased, by one winter's fashionable campaign in London!—The waste also of the means of life in such pursuits is incalculable. In luxury[1], one man may consume the labour of a hundred, or a thousand, or a hundred thousand: a large standing army is frequently a mere enhancement of the luxuriousness of prodigal royalty. Population not only depends on the constitution of the government, but every particular,—domestic, civil, and political,—restricts or expands population. Rent, taxes, duty, excise, every law or regulation respecting property and liberty, operates as a medicine or a malady on human life. Equity, freedom, security, quicken inert matter into human beings, and sustain human happiness.

[1] In the East if there be 100 dishes, the guest must taste of each.

How shallow and partial are those, who would determine the amount of population by the quantity of provisions[1],—when œconomy or prodigality in the use of food, extrinsic of all other considerations, alters immensely the relations of subsistence and population!

CHAPTER II.

The considerations in the preceding chapter considered by a review of the population in China—perhaps no sufficient reasons for disbelieving its immense imputed population.—The Chinese never advanced beyond the second or middle state.

I SHALL exemplify the foregoing remarks by reviewing the supposed population of China. The embassy to that country, under the auspices of Lord Macartney, were informed that the Chinese amounted to 333 millions. This approaches the population of the whole earth according to Sir W. Petty's calculation, which he fixed at about 350 millions. The population[2] was disbelieved merely on account of the enor-

[1] One half of the world, it is supposed, live on rice and water. There are people who consume, man for man, in comparison to these, ten times as much. If the former live, can the latter be said barely to exist? This contrast is still stronger when we are told, "Certainly an Englishman would be dying for want of food, before he accepted an invitation to dine with the king of Lattakoo." Yet this king's prerogative seemed to Campbell to consist mainly in sitting near the pot that contained the boiled beans.

[2] It has been the fashion to decry the Chinese, because they had been inordinately eulogized, and they will not fraternize with us. Some have attempted to prove them comparatively a new people. Mons. de Guines is the most violent impugner of Chinese antiquity.

mity, without any regard to the combination of circumstances which authorize this statement. I have not seen any reason for denying it. Ministers to be sure are disposed to multiply the people of their respective states; but after an excessive number what can be gained by exaggeration? The repetition of 3 might appear suspicious: and I perceive that Dr. Price[1] assumes the sum to be paid off 33,333,000*l.* and that Sir James Steuart's[2] random conjecture is 333,333. How far this circumstance may operate against the 333 millions, I leave to the ingenuity of the reader.

It is said that in the reign of Tching-tsong[3] a census was made in China of all those who cultivated the ground, and that they amounted to 21,976,965. In Canghi's reign the census was repeated[4], when the population amounted to 59,788,364, exclusive of the learned and magistrates, and soldiers, and of those who lived on rafts and on the rivers. A census in 1761 makes the people, it is said, amount to 198,214,553. Since that time, independent of the

Instead of subsisting, he says, 3000 years before Christ, he will not admit their empire "reuni d'une manière stable de depuis 529 ans." He might as truly determine the age of the French by the time when Guienne, Burgundy, &c. were resumed by the King of France. I am very indifferent whether China is young, or old, or middle-aged; but I may state that Mons. Delandine says, p. 140, that he found among the manuscripts at Lyons one in Chinese, which notices an astronomical observation made in China, which he specifies. He adds, that the conjunction alluded to, took place the 28th of February, 2549 years before the Christian æra.

[1] Annuities, &c. p. 117. [2] vol. 1. p. 79.

[3] Duhalde's China, vol. 1. p. 428. [4] Ibid. vol. 2. p. 20.

multiplication of the people, the dominion of China has been enlarged.

All travellers through China agree respecting the apparently immense population of China. Missionaries and ambassadors all concur with Lord Macartney, who says, "The number of villages is wonderful: the population is almost incredible[1]." It has been calculated[2] that 333 millions would be only 256 persons to a square mile: this, supposing the Chinese territory is not taken too low, is less than the population of the United Provinces, which contained 270 to a square mile; and is only about a fifth more than the population of Bengal, that harassed province[3], which according to Mr. Colebrooke contains 25 millions of persons, or 203 to a square mile.

The reasons for believing the populousness of China are many. The climate is good[4]; the soil is generally fertile; and tillage is universally encouraged by the laws of property and inheritance, and by the moderate impost on the land. It pays no tithe, little rent; the taxation of the empire is inconsiderable, amounting to 12,140,625*l*., each person being charged about eightpence a-year[5]. By the law of succession

[1] Post. Works, vol. 2. p. 203. [2] Barrow's Travels, p. 576.

[3] According to Tytler, the waste land in Bengal is immense. vol. 1. p. 99. He says again: the villages through Bengal are at great distance, and the lands only in their immediate vicinity are cultivated. p. 112. *Nearly one half of the country is a wild and useless jungle*; nay worse, for it harbours buffaloes and wild hogs, which ravage on every side. This account renders the imputed excess of people in China to India probable.

[4] Duhalde, vol. 2. p. 25.

[5] Mr. Tombe says the Chinese are taxed for their long nails—Who told him this?

land is subdivided by every generation, and any unoccupied land is grantable and granted by the government to any one who will cultivate it.

Such a system is favourable to agriculture. Lord Macartney[1] believes "there is not an acre of cultivable land in China which is not cultivated." Mr. Barrow's[2] account does not harmonize with this position: he supposes that for want of agricultural instruments a very considerable portion, *perhaps of the richest land*, remains untilled. Had he said of ordinary or inferior land, he would be intelligible and just. Du Halde speaks of uncultivated heaths; and Mr. Ellis noticed large tracts untilled. Mons. de Guines[3], as Mr. Barrow says, dispraisingly—"en général ils labourent peu profondement: la charrue n'entre guerre au dela de quatre ou cinque pouces dans la terre, où l'on seme le riz." Should it go deeper? The fact is, that the plough is little used in China comparatively to the spade. The value or meaning of these authors is problematical. Mr. Barrow[4] denies that the Chinese have much merit as agriculturists; contrary to Lord Macartney[5], who asserts, "The Chinese are certainly the best husbandmen in the world." Yet Mr. Barrow bears testimony "to their skill and industry in raising the greatest possible quantity of vegetables from a given piece of ground:" thus distinguishing between agriculturists and horticulturists. The disagreement between these writers is indifferent to me; for the Chinese mode of agriculture favours

[1] Post. Works, vol. 2. p. 379.
[2] China, p. 567.
[3] Voyage en Pekin, t. 3. p. 327.
[4] p. 568.
[5] Post. Works, vol. 2. p. 360.

the great population of China. It exhibits the remedy of Hobbes for a numerous people, "to live closer, and cultivate each spot exactly." The Chinese are excellent labourers. The Europeans who possessed Ceylon could not raise vegetables for the table; yet the Chinese succeeded. Mrs. Graham says, "I saw not only esculent vegetables of every kind, but thriving sugar-canes, under their management[1]."

Œconomy is a fundamental law in China; an officer must not use horses when the ordinance specifies asses[2]. This I have no doubt regards thrift. The Hebrews also were prohibited from multiplying horses.

The Chinese assiduously convert every refuse thing to some account: whatever is edible they eat; but rice is so perpetually their food[3], that it enters into every compound which signifies eating. They eat little flesh[4], are temperate perhaps beyond any other people, though some indulge in spiced wine and a ——, like Chou-ta-gin; and others delight in edible swallows nests, for which China affords the best market. The people are disposed to marriage, as are all unsophisticated people. Infanticide, or exposing

[1] India, p. 94. They did not succeed in Trinidad; for they became sickly by the voyage, and had been accustomed at home to use cattle in the cultivation of sugar-canes.

[2] Chinese Code, p. 258. Marco Polo says, In Persia asses are dearer than horses, because they eat little, carry much, and travel far. Pinkerton, vol. 7. p. 112.

[3] Barrow, p. 547.

[4] There is a discourse in Chinese, delivered in the person of an ox, dehorting from eating beef. This is held a monstrous fable by him, who says it has great effect, and prevents one in ten, or one in twenty, from eating beef. What is there monstrous in this fable that is not in other fables? Rev. R. Morrison's Horæ Sinicæ.

children, as a custom with which the Chinese have been charged, is unfounded[1]. That a city inhabited by three millions of people should contain many improvident and miserable, is necessary: but of the children supposed to be purposely destroyed, many are still-born. Sir G. T. Staunton says[2], infanticide is seldom committed, except in cases of very defective formation, or in the anguish of hopeless poverty.

"Die, little wretch! ere yet thy sorrows live,
Take the last boon thy helpless sire can give."

In Tonquin it is expressly affirmed that exposing children is unknown.

Education in China seems comparatively excellent. I have already noticed its particulars in "National Education." I shall therefore merely say, that in China the object is not to teach the least in the longest time, and to destroy both the temper and the mind, by forcing scragged and futile and fanatical systems on infancy: Chinese teachers inculcate what is useful[3]. Literature is in the highest honour, and each man is his own patron. "These (literary) pursuits[4] are professedly the sole channel of introduction to

[1] I wonder Mons. Say could write of "la grande destruction d'enfans à la Chine," &c. t. 2. p. 145. It has been said that children have been eaten as a specific in certain diseases. Osbeck's China, vol. 2. p. 235. It might as well be said they eat men in France, because l'Homme appears at the head of a French Materia Medica.

[2] Preface to Chinese Code, p. 10.

[3] Ils (les Chinois) veulent que les jeunes gens aient un fond d'idées, de connoissances, de reflexions, et de vues, &c. Mémoires des Missionnaires, &c. t. 9.

[4] Sir G. T. Staunton's Chinese Code, p. 12.

political advancement in the state; to offices, rank, and honours of almost every description." Useful knowledge, that which leads to practical wisdom, forms the basis of their studies; the tenour of all their literature is moral. Du Halde says[1] that the Chinese novels are moral historical romances. Their fables have the same object. All these things emphatically educate the people. What they are at home we may learn by their conduct abroad. A writer in the Quarterly Review[2], from actual knowledge, says, that in Java the Chinese are industrious and peaceable; that they are chief proprietors in every town and village in the island; and that they are selected as chief magistrates, on account of their probity and sagacity. Such are some of the reasons for the populousness of China.

Those which deduct from the full measure of this conclusion are: first the monarchy; and next the Tartar conquest of the country, which has increased the evils of the monarchy, for the soldiery are Tartars[3]; and a Tartar is frequently associated with a Chinese, not so much to assist him, as to countervail the danger of a pure Chinese magistracy to a Tartar dynasty. The monarchy is extensive: yet the evil of extent has some peculiar advantages in China. If Mirabeau had any good grounds for stating that the excessive population in China induces moderation in the government, we may add that the vast circle of

[1] vol. 3. p. 113. [2] December 1811, p. 500, 503.

[3] "Every Tartar male child is accordingly enrolled." Barrow, p. 412.

China ensures an active administration [1], for any great remissness must dissolve such unwieldy province .

There are peculiarities respecting the monarchy of China, which render it infinitely less oppressive than the monarchies of Europe [2], or even than some of those states which presume to be free. The monarchy is at once hereditary and elective—the eldest son of the last emperor does not necessarily succeed. There are various checks to the wilfulness of the monarch, and to the component parts of the administration. His proclamations at least exhibit some decency. The broad lie is not the sum of the state papers of the overweening king, as in Christendom, and self-reproach often accompanies his public reproof. In another point the emperor of China may be contrasted with the kings of Europe :—With a revenue of twelve millions, Kien-long, the last emperor, upheld a mighty army [3]; provided for all the expenses of the

[1] From Pekin to Canton is 1200 miles. Government despatches have arrived the 12th day. Staunton, p. 252.

[2] It is thought to be more ceremonious :—it may be so; but the court ceremonies in Europe are amazing to a common apprehension. The mere circumstances of *sieges à bras*, and *sieges à dos*, and their placing, would require a treatise. See Wickfort, p. 488. 525. The court of Louis the XIVth was rich in topics of this learning.

[3] It may be thought that a million in China is much more valuable in exchange than a million in England; yet if we calculate the soldier's pay of the two countries, it is not so very unequal. A horseman receives three ounces three-tenths of silver, at *6s.* 8*d.* each, and fifteen measures of rice. A foot soldier one ounce and six-tenths of silver, and ten measures of rice. Macartney, vol. 2. p. 480. Which is about *5d.* a day, with rice, for a foot soldier. This was not much less than the pay of a foot soldier in England before the last war.

government; distributed large sums in charity; and beside restoring the taxes to particular provinces, he five times remitted all the taxes payable in specie[1], and three times all the taxes paid in kind throughout the empire.

The chief reason of this œconomy is; the Chinese monarchy has no Gothic incumbrances. There is no antiquated nobility; all titles, except those enjoyed by the descendants of Confucius preceding 1644, being resumed[2]. The few hereditary nobles are principally Tartar chieftains reduced to vassalage[3]; these are the only Corinthian capitals of this immense monarchy, with the exception of the princes of the imperial family[4], who enjoy prerogatives, one of which is, that they only shall educate castrated children for eunuchs.

The monarchy of China subsists without an ecclesiastical establishment; not one bishop, priest, or deacon belongs to the Chinese empire, though it has been found that a bishop and the like are required for British India; they have no religious establishment[5], no clergy, no religious assemblies, no stated season for public or private prayer, and the teachers of tolerated sects are actually under *surveillance* as troublesome and perfidious, and are obliged to wear a particular dress[6]. The Christian doctrines are particularly offensive to the emperor[7], who has been incensed by the surreptitious efforts of the missionaries; and he stigmatizes

[1] Staunton, p. 479.
[2] Ibid. p. 49.
[3] Chinese Code, p. 391.
[4] Chinese Code, p. 412.
[5] Barrow, Daniell, Staunton, p. 42.
[6] Staunton, p. 186.
[7] See Appendix to Sir G. T. Staunton's Chinese Code.

certain doctrines with the most contemptible epithets[1]: nor is it improbable, that the conduct of the followers of peace-loving Christianity in his neighbourhood, has induced him to believe that Christians are confessed hypocrites.

Some things are particularized in favour of this monarchy, which to me are the reverse. The great doctrine, respect to parents[2], is consummate: but this, like other maxims, is forced by a fictitious diversion to signify obedience from the subject to the prince, he being considered the father of his people. This is the tone of the canting Catharine, the *soi-disant* "tender mother" of the Poles. The prince who addresses his subjects with paternity, rejoices rather in their weakness than his own equity. The justice of a master to his slave, says Aristotle[3], is not identical with that of a parent to his child, ἀλλ' ὅμοιον: that is, in practice it is absolute. In consequence, flogging is very general in China; or, if we believe Sir G. T. Staunton[4], we should rather say *has been* general in China. This

[1] The emperors of China seem to have had little faith from olden time. It is said, that some drawing an omen from some storks, Tai-tsong remarked, "What signifies it to me! it is a happy omen to have wise men about me." Duhalde, vol. 1. p. 392; which equals Homer's reply to the seer.

[2] It is of great antiquity in Greece. Apud Stobæum, sermo 77, p. 458–461.

[3] Ethic. ad Eudem. lib. 4. c. 4. t. 2. p. 235.

[4] He says, "Though every page of the following translation may seem, at first sight, to bear testimony to the universality of corporal punishments in China; yet so many exceptions and mitigations will be found, that the penal system will be found to abandon almost entirely that part of its apparent character." Preface, p. 27.

is intelligible, as few husbands *correct* their wives[1] in England, as they might have done by the common law; and masters have also disclaimed a similar abuse of their servants[2]. But it has amazed me exceedingly, that so many intelligent English should wince at the bambooing of all orders of Chinese—mandarins and peasants, &c. That this might have alarmed a Roman, when the *lex Porcia*[3] prohibited a Roman citizen from being beaten with rods; or a Frank, who was equally inviolate by the Salique law[4], is easily understood;—but the English have no right to be startled at this practice, as their own soldiers are flogged and re-flogged[5] contrary to acknowledged law: and if flogging be admitted, which I deprecate, there is no reason why chiefs should not suffer as well as subordinates: except we take a comment on equity from the votes of the Commons of England[6], and the judgements of the Lords.

[1] Blackstone's Commentaries, b. 1. c. 15.

[2] "If the master designeth correction to his servant, and accordingly useth it; and the servant, by some misfortune, dieth thereof; this is not murder, but *per infortunium*; because the law alloweth him to use moderate correction; and therefore the deliberate purpose thereof is not *ex malitia præcognita*." Hale's Pleas of the Crown, vol. 1. p. 454.

[3] Cicero, t. 2. p. 311, 37. [4] Pastoret, part 2. p. 87.

[5] General Ferguson stated that he knew, at Fort Charles, 300 men receive in two years 54,000 lashes. There is no country like England in this respect:—the janizaries, when flogged, seldom receive more than forty blows, and they are so given as not to disable the sufferer from marching. Thornton, vol. 1. p. 228. The Spanish soldiers in South America are not flogged. Pike's Travels.

[6] Thus a tinman offered a bribe to a prime minister,—and the attorney-general prosecuted the gnat. Lord Melville admitted that he had disposed of 10,000*l.* of the public money contrary to act of parliament,—and his peers acquitted him on an impeachment.

There is no distinction but the greater or less crime. If we regard persons, certainly the greater the person the greater the crime, and of course the more exemplary should be his punishment; which is the law of China[1]. This is not the place for comparing the laws of China, or judging minutely their merit: they err, as in other monarchies, particularly in the penalties pronounced against treason[2]; and they excell in their tenderness towards women, as daughters and wives[3]; far surpassing, or rather they are contrasted with the English laws[4] in this respect, as they are to that execrable judicial dogma[5], That he who cannot pay in his purse shall pay in his person.

Much has been written against their jealousy of admitting the entry of foreigners, and of permitting the departure of their own people. This is pernicious to population, did it merely prevent the acquisition of knowledge from abroad: but its operation in this instance is more direct; for the bar to the intercourse with foreigners, as it has prevented the small islands along the coast from being inhabited by the Chinese[6], and their government not having shipping to give effect to this regulation, the islands are occupied by pirates. Here again the jealousy of the government impairs the entire prosperity of the people: from the same suspicion, they are passive in their foreign commerce,

[1] Chinese Code, p. 384. [2] Ibid. p. 269. [3] Ibid. p. 150, 459.

[4] "The indecent, wanton, and cruel custom of putting irons on the weaker sex in prisons, is not practised in any of the most uncivilized countries that I have visited." Howard on Lazarettos, p. 176.

[5] Chinese Code, p. 365. [6] Staunton, p. 238.

which is limited to a single port. Yet considering the immensity of China,—its rivers, canals communicating with the great canal, which is only less wonderful than the great wall,—we might say, internal commerce in China is also foreign commerce. Lord Macartney[1] expressed the utmost admiration at the number of vessels in the Pæyho; and Mr. Barrow[2], who is of a less sanguine temperament, has no difficulty in saying, "I firmly believe that all the floating vessels in the world besides, taken collectively, would not equal either in number or tonnage those of China."

From all these circumstances, and others which I omit for brevity, I do not perceive any reason for doubting the population ascribed to China. Mr. Barrow says[3], it is not overstocked with people. And Mr. Ellis indirectly says more[4]. Yet a better government would increase the comforts of society in China, or abate its misery. In fact, it appears that, except in moral instruction, and perhaps gardening[5],

[1] Post. Works, vol. 2. p. 182. [2] p. 399.

[3] p. 579. Duhalde says, the Chinese have recourse to every invention to procure subsistence. vol. 2. p. 125.

[4] "I have been much struck in all Chinese towns and villages, with the number of persons apparently of the middle classes. From this I am inclined to infer a wide diffusion of the substantial comforts of life, and the consequent financial capacity of the country. However absurd the pretensions of the emperor of China may be to universal supremacy, it is impossible to travel through his dominions without feeling that he has the finest country, within an imperial ring-fence, in the world." p. 323.

[5] The Chinese gardening is the reverse of the Mogul taste. At Surat, parterres are the taste; and so to plant them that they may exhibit a Turkey carpet is the effort. Forbes, p. 23.

"..... which not nice art
In beds and curious knots, but nature boon
Pour'd out profuse on hill and dale and plain,"

the Chinese have never advanced beyond the secondary stages: nor is this strange, when we consider their pertinacious adherence to custom. So little have the course of time and the progress of events altered their habits, that it is said, the expressions and style of modern writers differ little from the language of Confucius and that of his immediate followers.

The whole system may be pronounced secondary and inferior:—a monarchy directly sprung from the patriarchal state, with the obligation of a council, which probably rules when the emperor is inert or inefficient, and which is a mere name when he is strenuous and intelligent. The laws are minute in the extreme, prohibiting by lines and punishing by units. The details respecting mourning are extreme[1], and the penalties on transgression numerous. The sumptuary laws regard houses, apartments, carriages, dress, and furniture; while custom overpowers and impedes the business and pursuits of life with forms and ceremonies[2]. The laws respecting domestic industry evince the same spirit: To manufacture silks, satins, gauzes, or other stuffs, according to the prohibited pattern of the *lung*[3] or the *fung-whang*, is punishable by forfeiture of goods and a hundred blows. The exclusion of their people from foreign trade equals their internal regulations: yet the Chinese government seems to

[1] Chinese Code, p. 75, 112, 113, 487.

[2] Chinese Code, p. 185. Du Halde says there are three invitations to the same feast. vol. 2. p. 191.

[3] Ibid. p. 467.

have much juster notions on some points of trade than England's ambassador, who was amazed that the Hong merchants were not sensible of any disadvantage from the export of silver from Canton to India[1]; and still juster than our laws, which rejoice in error and contradiction:—by them, to export a few guineas is penal, but millions may be transferred at once without inquiry or offence.

The currency of the country is in the same inferior state: they have copper coin, but large payments are made by ingots[2]:—thus things are rather bartered than sold. They use the hoe and the spade, seldom employing the plough. Barrow's words are[3], "Two-thirds of the land in China are cultivated by the spade and hoe, without the aid of draft cattle." This is an advance beyond the people mentioned by Park: "The application of animal labour to the purposes of agriculture is no-where adopted, the plough therefore is wholly unknown (in the Negro territories); the chief implement used in husbandry is the hoe." The use of men instead of cattle in the more operose parts of agriculture is partly unfavourable to tillage, though it may generally increase the amount of the people; as does the practice of using men to carry what in other countries are borne by horses[4]. It may be remarked, that when New Spain was conquered, a numerous

[1] His words are: "I have been told, that some silver has of late been carried away by the country-ships from Canton to India; and that the Hong merchants, considering silver as a mere merchandise, did not appear sensible of any disadvantage from the trade." Post. Works, vol. 2. p. 517.

[2] Staunton, p. 124. In some of the provinces Spanish dollars have been introduced. [3] p. 585. [4] Duhalde, vol. 2. p. 158.

class of the people was employed in carrying burthens on the highways; and it continues. In this respect China and South America coincide.

A thousand circumstances denote an early improvement and a sudden stop in China. This observation is corroborated by many instances. Their signs for sounds are not letters, but abbreviated symbols or pictures. They consist of 214 elementary characters, which in their combination constitute 80,000 words [1], a cumbrous and inefficient machinery. Though long acquainted with printing, they have not attained the discovery of metallic or moveable types [2]. Though literary, or rather a moralizing people, they have little taste for composition; and none of their various works exhibits harmony or grace in its design or execution. Their novels, as I said, are mere romances; and the better theatrical pieces, novels represented; which, with some exceptions, are a mixture of comedy, tragedy, and song; and are just as much below the true drama, as the Italian Opera is beyond it [3]. Their tragedies in their moral tone, represent the philosophers and heroes of the nation [4], and correspond to those exhibited in Peru, according to the report of Garcillasso della Vega [5]. The scene is absolutely representative: If a wife kill her husband, he appears with a bloody gash above his eyes, and reels and falls on the stage. If a man be executed, the audience beholds the deed; the head rolls on the stage, and the body staggers after

[1] Lord Macartney, vol. 2. p. 492. [2] Duhalde, vol. 1. p. 351, 416.
[3] See Duhalde, vol. 3. p. 195-196.
[4] Acosta, part. 9. lib. 6. c. 6. [5] c. 17.

it[1]: and Mons. de Guines mentions[2], that the chief personage in a piece *devint grosse, et accoucha sur le théâtre d'un enfant*. Nor does it appear that at court theatrical exhibitions are of a higher cast: tumblers, mountebanks, and laureats seem to regale the majesty of China; which, however, are not so absurd or expensive as the masques and mummeries exhibited in the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles: nor does it appear that the emperor participates, as Charles the Martyr did, in a court masque[3], and as Louis the Fourteenth did in a ballet. I have spoken of the tenour of the Chinese dramas: for "The Heir in his Old Age," translated by Mr. Davis, and eight hundred years old, resembles the Grecian drama, which seems to me at least one degree less advanced than the best English tragedies.

The Chinese are excellent imitators, which they enjoy with the Russians; as artists they have little merit; in painting, they exhibit the whole face. This agrees with Abyssinian art: "The Abyssinians in their pictures always strangely exaggerate the dominion of the eye, and invariably draw the figures with full face[4]." They are so fond of fact in their designs, that they cannot endure relief. Thus their taste conforms to queen Elizabeth's judgement[5], as exhibited in her own portraits, who would be painted without shadow.

Chinese architecture is mean, and only an improve-

[1] Mr. Barrow mentions the former, and Mr. Wathen this instance.

[2] t. 2. p. 324.

[3] Finet Ambassadors, p. 48.

[4] Salt's Travels, p. 395.

[5] According to the Pythagoreans, souls don't wink nor cast shadows. Plutarch. Moral. p. 181.

ment on tents. They have no mirrors, nor windows of glass[1]; metal serves for the one, and oyster-shells for the other. They have neither wind- nor water-mills[2], employing querns or handmills, which is just an improvement on the negro practice of beating the grain in a mortar[3]. Their travelling carriages are not better than a higgler's cart[4]; and they are very deficient in practical mechanics[5], in medicine, in surgery—a fracture being commonly attended with death[6]. In ship-building they are equally deficient: for though they admire European ships, it would be criminal to improve their own rude vessels[7]; which all those among us who dread reform[8], and decry it as an innovation, must greatly admire. Their vessels therefore resemble the tub-formed merchant-ships of the ancients; and like them they keep close to the shore[9], except when the voyage obliges a bolder navigation: in short, they seem to be now, what the Seres were two or three thousand years ago. *Seres mites quidem sed et ipsi feris persimiles, cœtum reliquorum mortalium fugiunt cum commercia expectant*[10]. Thus I have partially sketched the mode of estimating the populousness of countries, by a view of the circumstances and condition of the Chinese; which may

[1] Macartney, vol. 2. p. 480.
[2] Duhalde, vol. 2. p. 125.
[3] Park's Travels, p. 10.
[4] Macartney, vol. 2. p. 420.
[5] Barrow, p. 90.
[6] Macartney, vol. 2. p. 364.
[7] Duhalde, vol. 2. p. 136.
[8] We have again failed in an embassy:—Who can read the difficulties on the bows, and not be enamoured of court ceremonies? The kou-tou is a ceremony of the Empire;—we knew this: then why do we furnish an embassy, and resist compliance?
[9] Barrow, p. 39.
[10] Plin. Nat. Hist. lib. 6. c. 17.

also advance or explain other particulars in the philosophy of man. The account of the population of China may be exaggerated: yet, considering the climate, the soil and extent of China; the disposition to marry; the state of property; the cultivation of the land; that they are thrifty, industrious, managing, and abstemious; that they pay little rent, few taxes, no tithes; that no ecclesiastical establishment is charged on the people's labour, nor nobles, nor paupers, nor colonies;—considering all these things, and that there are few wars, and an immense internal trade, it does not appear to me improbable, though I by no means say it is authenticated,—that the immense territory of China contains 333 millions of people.

CHAPTER III.

On populous cities.

HAVING illustrated some prominent points respecting population, by a commentary on the most populous country that ever existed; I repeat that I do not dread the populousness of nations, nor am I alarmed by any local excess or partial throng of inhabitants. I fear bad government and external violence. Ten thousand times a country has become too populous for the subsistence, by the devastations of war and conquest. The same has inordinately increased the population of neighbouring states. Foreign misery has had this effect. The suffering of traders in 1810 and 1811 increased and incommoded the population of the Isle of Man. Rome latterly

has exhibited every vicissitude of evil. It wanted people when the pope transferred his court to Avignon; the population having declined, it is said, in these seventy-two years of absence, to 30,000; and it increased intolerably by the ship-loads of Jesuits which were consigned to the holy father when this society was disgraced.

Delos lost its people by a fantasy of the Athenians, who carried off wholly the inhabitants from the island[1]. On the contrary, when the Romans destroyed Corinth, and dealt ruin largely through the Mediterranean states, Delos was a second time re-born, and became an entrepôt of Greece, Italy, and Asia[2]. The deficiency and excess of people in either case were imposed on the Delians; therefore they were not responsible for the inconvenience, but the governments which prepared or obliged these extraordinary situations. In like manner the government which fondles and pampers a manufacture, and with it forces a population, is answerable for the evils attending this exotic multiplication of mankind. Thus the misery which now afflicts society through every class and profession is not referable to the people, but to our warring wasting government, which squandered the property or perverted the capital of the state; and thus for the time greatly encouraged labour and pro-

[1] Thucydides, lib. 5. p. 343. They afterwards replaced them by order of the Oracle. p. 366.

[2] Eo enim negotiatores commigrarunt, præsertim cum templi immunitas accesserit, et ipsius portus invitat occasio. Etenim ex Italia et e Græcia in Asiam navigantibus, &c. Strabo, lib. 10. Cicero pro Lege Manilia, t. 2. p. 250.

duce, and of course called numbers into life and activity, who now, while the means which employed them are lost or mortgaged to satisfy the public creditor, want occupation altogether, or are insufficiently remunerated by their wages, which are further so diminished by taxation, that they relapse incessantly on the parish. I repeat, I am not afraid of population. If the people over-breed, as they suffer, they will remedy the evil. What is dreadful, is bad government, monstrous projects, tyranny, and conquest; because these press hardly on the innocent multitude, and lightly on the infatuated: "Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi." This, and not over-breeding, is dreadful: for here the punishment is not retributory; the crime is the rulers', while the satisfaction is reserved for the people.

Much contradiction has been expressed relative to great cities. By great cities I mean the capital and secondary cities in Europe. The supposed evils resulting from them, when they were very inferior to what they are at present, caused limitary laws to be enacted respecting them in different countries. By the 35th of Elizabeth, c. 6, the erection of new buildings within three miles of London or Westminster was prohibited. The fear of an increasing capital was common in the reigns of James[1] and Charles and during the Commonwealth. Whitelock says[2], "that in 1657 there was much debate on the bill for restraint of buildings in and about London:"—it passed. The same was proposed in Charles the Second's reign,

[1] Hume, vol. 6. p. 169. James proclaimed and warned and exhorted.

[2] Memorials, p. 661, 662.

which was abandoned, according to Clarendon[1], because it seemed to interfere with the liberty of the people. An ordinance was made in 1545 in France, prohibiting the increase of Paris, expressly through terror of populousness: "que les sujets multiplians," &c.[2] Harrington is therefore inaccurate in his reflections on this particular[3]; for the French government wished to limit not only Paris, but all the great cities[4]. Whether any law was enacted to the same effect in Holland, I do not know; but we hear from Temple, that many thought the enlargement of Amsterdam was injurious to the state[5]. This dread of populous cities has not been confined to modern legislators. Pheidon of Corinth prohibited the increase of houses in Corinth[6]. Aristotle relates the fact; who, though disagreeing with Pheidon, seems not unfriendly to some restrictions on population, as he says it is almost impossible to govern well a very populous

[1] History, book 4. p. 212.

[2] Bodin de la Republique, liv. 5. p. 546. This policy equalled the knowledge of that time:—Paris was then supposed to contain three millions. Duhalde's China, vol. 2. p. 10.

[3] He says, "But should a man tell them at Paris, or Grand Cairo, (in the latter whereof the plague is more frequent and furious than happens with us,) that they are not to build houses nor increase so much, lest they should have the plague; or that children should not be born so fast, lest they die,—they would think it strange news." Oceana, p. 302.

[4] L'ancien gouvernement de France bornait l'extension des grandes villes. Rien ne peut justifier ce systême, si ce n'est la mauvaise humeur des fermiers generaux, qui n'aimaient pas voir s'établir hors des barriers des cabarets, où l'ou ne payait point de droit. E. Polit. tom. 2. p. 167.

[5] Works, vol. 1. p. 69.

[6] De Repub. lib. 2. c. 6.

state[1]. When we read of such expressions and terrors concerning states of twenty or thirty or a hundred thousand inhabitants, we must not smile at the *naïveté* of a lady at St. Helena, who remarked, that "the arrival of the India fleet in England must make London very gay."

Authors haye followed and probably preceded legislators; they have spoken of great cities with unmeasured reprobation. Filangieri rails without reasoning, calling cities sumptuous sepulchres which a dying nation raises and enlarges to receive its very ashes[2]. Dr. Price rails and calculates and graduates, that London, which required six thousand recruits annually in the time of Graunt, did, when he himself wrote, consume ten thousand persons more than it produced; that the expectation of lives in great towns was twenty-one, of middling towns twenty-five, of the country thirty-seven.

Some on the contrary are consoled by the destruction of life in great towns; which, though they cannot advance it to the dignity of a final cause, is in their estimate a demand fully sufficient to destroy Mr. Malthus's geometrical supply. This observation has been claimed as an invention by Mr. Weyland, just as truly as Mr. Malthus's dogma is the creation of his genius. Sir James Steuart, who admits the unhealthiness of great cities, and "that the prolongation of life is more a private than a public concern[3]," insists that Paris has purged the country of idle mouths[4]. Thus Sir James Steuart patronized consumption as

[1] lib. 7. c. 4. [2] Della Legislazione, tom. 1. p. 372.
[3] vol. 1. p. 53. [4] vol. 1. p. 103.

much as Mr. Weyland, or as the British legislators, who, to serve the staple, command that all shall be buried in woollen. He says, "If the same number of inhabitants in the city of Paris consume four times as much of any necessary article as formerly, I hope it will be allowed that the production of such necessaries must be four times as abundant[1]." This does not follow; for the expenditure does not prove the existence of a proportionate supply, it only proves that there is a supply. Those who regard consumption as a good, or as a remedy, should honour plagues and conflagrations.

I do not wish to conceal the evils of populous cities. Those who consider long life, with the Chinese, one of the few instances of human felicity, must be distressed by the more rapid dissolution of mankind in great cities. They are particularly destructive to infant children. In Stockholm and Vienna, one half that are born die before they are two years old[2], while in the country the majority attain the age of thirty-five or forty years. As is the effort to live, such is the chance against existence. The pulsations of the heart of infants are about 140 in a minute; hence the purity of the air is more particularly necessary to infants. Cities are fatal to men of all ages. In Stockholm the mortality is as one to nineteen; while in Stoke-Damarel in Devonshire deaths are as one to fifty-four[3]. Yet it does also appear that towns are not mortal in proportion to their populousness. London

[1] vol. 1. p. 143.

[2] Percival's Works, vol. 2. p. 356. Bishop Hough says one-third.

[3] Percival's Works, vol. 2. p. 324.

is less fatal to children than Stockholm; and London may be still more improved, though it can never, I fear, be rendered equally kind to life as the country. Yet should London be dissipated, were it possible, and its people be planted on dry hills, because we are told the Macrobii lived on Athos[1]?

Besides the constantly greater consumption of life in cities, occasional mortalities are incomparably more numerous; they sometimes exhibit not merely deaths, but desolation. In 1771, in the course of nine months 56,672 person died in Moscow[2]; and it is remarkable, that neither in these nine months of mortality, nor in the six months succeeding, does a single birth appear in the statistical table.

What is pernicious to life frequently impairs generation, and that which escapes death is often imperfect. The natives of London are comparatively small. Here let me observe, that writers on population have disregarded the different characters of man, as animals and as intelligent beings. They talk of population as of abstract numbers, though ten times the number may not have half the strength of another nation[3]. Colquhoun says[4] (it is no calculation), that when he was inspector of the balloted militia, twenty-five or thirty were under size in London. It would appear that as London increased in people, it decreased in *men*. Fitzstephen says[5], that

[1] Polyhistor, lib. 1. c. 17.

[2] Tooke's History of Russia, vol. 1. p. 602.

[3] As when the youth have been cut off, or the men leaving women and children, &c.

[4] On Indigence, p. 159.

[5] Barrington's Ancient Statutes, p. 108.

in Henry the Second's reign London could muster 20,000 horse and 60,000 infantry; yet in Henry the Eighth's reign the muster did not exceed 15,000 men[1]. How many warriors could now be arrayed out of its 1,050,000 inhabitants, including major Sturgeon and the six regiments of trained bands in its battle, I cannot guess. The decline is not peculiar to our metropolis. Costanza makes a similar remark respecting Naples; which Giannone[2] pursues, saying, that this city, which abounded with illustrious cavaliers, could now (when he wrote) raise with difficulty one thousand men completely armed. Naples is one of the most populous cities in Europe. It is to be observed, that the reduction of the animal man does not entirely depend on the extent of cities. The individual generally declines with the increase of numbers. Holland and Venice increased in people and decreased in active citizens. How inferior are the most warlike nations in Europe, considering their population and combatants, to the vilest tribe of savages! When France had 650,000 troops, Peuchet computed that there was not one in seventy of the whole population under arms. This, though excessive, is trifling in comparison to the armed people of some of the dependencies of that country. Milbert says that the white population in the Isle of France is 14,000, of whom 3000 are capable of bearing arms. Yet this is exceeded by its neighbouring island. Orme[3] says, that the families settled in Bourbon have multiplied to 4000, of whom 1000

[1] Hume's History, vol. 4. p. 271. [2] lib. 24. p. 277.

[3] vol. 1. p. 93. History of Hindostan.

are capable of bearing arms. This is again outdone by the Indians sixty miles from James' Town [1]. Of a population of 5000, 1500 were warriors; and the Belootches, consisting of 20,000 families, sent 10,000 horse into the field [2].

Capital cities may be comparatively immoral. I speak doubtfully of this:—yet they afford facilities, provoke the appetites, and equally minister to vice and its concealment. In London is aggregated all that is absurd and fantastical, abject and insulting, fraudulent and false; plotters and counterplotters, impostors and prostitutes; whores and mystagogues. "And upon her forehead was written Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth [3]."

The depredations committed in London of every kind are immense. It was said, that three-fourths of all the smuggling in England are effected through the port of London. The vice of the capital is so excessive that it overflows on its purlieus; and it appears that in one year Middlesex [4], which contains about the same population as Yorkshire, arraigned 1217 offenders, and Yorkshire 245. Yet we must not suppose that London, as a populous city, is peculiarly vicious. Crimes are committed at Pekin and Canton [5], which are unknown in minor cities, or in the country: and it appears from Bradford [6], that in Pennsylvania three-fourths of the convictions for

[1] Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, p. 139.
[2] Ayeen Akbari, vol. 2. p. 142. [3] Rev. chap. 17. ver. 5.
[4] Colquhoun's Police of the Metropolis, p. 613.
[5] Duhalde, vol. 2. p. 126. [6] Opinions, &c. p. 268.

robbery, burglary, &c. were committed in Philadelphia the capital of the province. Thus the chief cities of the oldest and newest people, unhappily, concur in their criminal excesses. Hence, I may remark, the most injudicious opinions are formed of nations. Individuals whose knowledge of the Spaniards was confined to Madrid, and of the Portuguese to Lisbon, condemned both, as base and profligate and incorrigible poltroons. They had only seen the platform and steps and Corinthian capitals, the frieze and cornice of royalty: but they had not seen the people, the vassals[1], the audacious rabble, who dare speak without faltering on the unblenched majesty of Spain, and of his *faithful* brother. The nobles, the king, as either Louis and their noblesse, fled —while the basis of the columns and architrave remained.

"Iberia! oft thy crestless peasantry
Have seen thy plumed hidalgo quit thy side;—
Have seen, yet dauntless stood, 'gainst fortune fought, and died."

Victor Alfieri[2], Sir John Moore, Nelson, had looked beyond the court and its minions; had seen the people,—and were true prophets of what they could accomplish. The Portuguese at least equalled the Spaniards. Mackinnon says of the former (and it is delightful to bear good testimony for the oppressed), "At a distance from the capital I know not any nation where there appears to be more pu-

[1] It is stated as a part of a penal sentence by the court of Lisbon,—that he *is divested of the honours and privileges of a vassal and servant.* Ann. Register, 1759, p. 220.

[2] Memoirs.

rity of morals than in Portugal." He also mentions, "The occupation of a servant is here by no means so degrading as in England and most parts of Europe." Can man for a moment think to whom and for what this people and the Spaniards are subjected, and not sicken when he reflects at the sad catastrophe to which England, at the expense of property and character, has boastingly reduced them?

To the government, political depravity, and to this, extensive moral debasement, is directly referable. It is the custom of some princes to oblige their principal subjects to reside near their court. Such has been the policy of the Spanish crown; such of Richlieu, who, under the show of annihilating warfare in the provinces, demolished all the chateaux; and thus he actually drove their proprietors into the capital. This same capital became populous, that the crown may possess hostages for the allegiance of the aristocracy.

Such objections may be made to populous cities. Yet some of these evils are not necessary; some may be palliated; and others are in direct opposition to the assemblage of many men.

First: It is not necessary that populous cities should be more vicious than the country; and I know villages that are comparatively more profligate than cities. No doubt thieves resort to the metropolis;—so do they to forests and mountains, and to the frontiers of nations. In London, one of the great causes of subordinate profligacy is the destitution of all police; or rather, as has appeared, by magistrates and their minions actually pandering to keepers of pub-

lic-houses [1], whose company often consists of prostitutes and rogues. The nefarious partiality in the licensing magistrates, and in all those minor agents of order and equity, constables and thief-catchers, who prepare the crime and prompt wretches to crush them—have been exposed principally by the zeal and industry of Mr. Bennet. That populous cities abounding in property may be more honest than the country parts of other nations, I could believe. Fortunately the position is not conjectural :—the fact is proved by Mirabeau, who by the by, in a letter [2] to Frederic Guillaume of Prussia the Second, on his accession to the throne said, "Sans doute encore il faut limiter l'étendue des villes, où il se crée, par l'excessive population, un nombre de choses qui corrompt tout." Mirabeau alluded by this observation to Berlin: yet the same writer speaking of another capital declared [3], "Amsterdam contient plus de deux cents mille ames. Je mets en fait que c'est la grande ville de l'Europe, où il se commet le moins d'assassinats et de desordres; j'y ai resté dix mois, pendant lesquels on n'a compté qu'un seul meurtre et très peude vols considérables." There are reasons why Amsterdam should be more vicious than Berlin :—it was more populous, there was a perpetual tide of strangers; and the floating property of Amsterdam equalled the fee-simple of sterile Prussia. Yet the bare difference between a monarchy with its vices, and a state though

[1] Vintners and prostitutes are classed together by the Hindoos. Moor's Hindoo Infanticide, p. 167.

[2] Appended to l'Histoire Secrete, &c. t. 2. p. 326.

[3] Lettres de Cachet, &c. t. 1. p. 223.

declined, yet possessing the institutions of a republic, produced this contrast; for the police was much more rigid in Berlin than Amsterdam.

The mortality of towns may be greatly reduced; and it has been so in London, by opening the leading passages, by the allineation of the streets, by preventives against the spread of diseases.

The third objection directly contravenes the expectable result from large associations of men; for instead of weakness, they should be a security against tyranny. "The people," said Demosthenes [1], "being singly inferior to many individuals, who are supported by their friends and their opulence, associate to resist their insults and oppression." Hence originate those unions which vicious governments force the people to assume in their self-defence, and which such governments assail by laws and their infraction. Men confederate in hamlets, hundreds, towns, cities, and states, to resist foreign or domestic outrage. According to Strabo, when the Carians by sea and the Bœotians by land wasted Attica, Cecrops, to protect, collected the people into twelve cities; and it is said Theseus [2] concentrated the inhabitants of Attica in Athens for their further security. It is certain that the Athenians, who were the most free, had the reputation of having first built towns [3].

Men are indisposed to live in strict associations, which cities imply, because men would be free: towns

[1] Adversus Midiam, p. 626.

[2] Pausanias, lib. 1. c. 22. Stephanus de Urbibus, p. 27.

[3] Πρωτοι γαρ Αθηναιοι τα αστη και τας πολεις εὑρειν ἱστορουνται. Stephanus de Urbibus, p. 28; and again, p. 131.

require regulations; to these men would not submit except to avoid greater evils. This opinion is supported by the human disposition and by facts. Elis was sacred and inviolable on account of the games; in consequence the people were so rural, that Polybius [1] says many of them did not visit the capital for two or three ages. Probably men would no more live by choice in cities than in fortified castles, or travel in caravans: yet in the ninth and tenth centuries this was the only secure mode of travelling in Europe; and until the accession of Henry the IVth in France, the mansions of all country gentlemen were fortified.

Danger is of different kinds. The kings of Europe were awed by their confederate conquerors, and to protect themselves they instituted many towns. Henry the Fowler, who began to reign in 920, built towns, ordering every tenth man, says Robertson [2], every ninth man, says Pütter [3], to remove from the country to them. Otho in the tenth century encouraged the citizens to form themselves into communities, in order to control the power of the court. Barbarossa and Philip the Gross pursued the same policy: so did Ximenes [4] on being appointed regent of Castille. Some of the British kings followed these examples; whether by imitation of the continental sovereigns, or that similar circumstances induced similar measures.

[1] lib. 4. The people of Epidaurus were the same, and called for that reason κονιπόδες, "dusty feet." Plutarch. Moral. p. 176.

[2] Charles the Fifth, No. 17, p. 208.

[3] Germanic Constitution, b. 2. c. 2.

[4] This was altered after his death, and caused much confusion. Townsend's Travels, vol. 1. p. 200.

As men associated (I speak not of family connexions) from danger, and submitted their private will to general discipline, cities confederated for the same cause;—such originated the Grecian and Ionian confederacies, the associations along the Rhine, in Swisserland, the Hanseatic league, and the like.

Fear or danger operated in consolidating the less and greater aggregates of men. In Corsica the houses are collected in villages [paeses]. Boswell [1] says, In no place are the houses scattered as in England. Sir J. Steuart [2] makes the same remark respecting the difference of living in France and England, and he attributed it to the insecurity of the French. And Hume [3] supposes that the decay of towns complained of by parliament in the reign of Henry the Eighth, if true, proceeded from the greater security, which enabled the people to leave the provincial towns and reside in the country. Whether my conjectures be just or not in this particular, I have no hesitation in believing that cities tend to strengthen the people, though they have frequently effected their subjection. Yet their good effects have been evinced by the instances I have enumerated: and it is remarkable that Pisistratus was not less anxious that the Athenians should retire from Athens, than the friends of liberty had been to compact them together. Mr. Mitford [4], of course, the patron of tyrants, refers this conduct to his loving-kindness and patriotism. What was the object of James the First in repelling the great English proprietors from London, I cannot aver: he has been

[1] Corsica, p. 21. [2] Polit. Œconomy, vol. 1. p. 102.
[3] History, vol. 4. p. 277. [4] History of Greece, vol. 1. p. 271.

praised, among his animadversions on that topic, for saying, "England will shortly be London, and London England [1]."

Lest I should be mistaken, I say distinctly that I favour large cities:—they, with all their imperfections, tend to strengthen the feebleness of individuals, and relieve the many from oppression. A populous city commands respect by its multitude, and the most populous city is commonly the least abused; which proceeds as much from the numbers of the people as from their being the seat of government. Constantinople is an instance: "The rajahs there have been denominated free and happy, when their condition has been compared with that of the tributary subjects, who are placed at a greater distance from the centre of this vast monarchy [2]." In some respect, then, it is not inaptly called "the refuge of the world [3]." It is not only the capital that is so distinguished: Volney speaks of the chief cities of the provinces as the only places that escape the tyranny of the seraglio [4].

Citizens are much more alive to their rights, have a quicker apprehension, and are more on the advance, than country gentlemen and their rustic companions, "whose talk is of oxen." "Pardon me, Phædrus [5]," said Socrates, "I am anxious to learn;—trees can teach me nothing, but men in a city," &c. Voltaire

[1] Hobhouse says, One person asked him whether England was London, or London England. p. 594. The wisdom of a king is often folly in a subject.

[2] Thornton's Turkish Empire, vol. 2. p. 19.

[3] Hobhouse, p. 820.

[4] Voyage en Syrie, &c. t. 2. p. 268. Walpole says the same of the people of Asia Minor. [5] Plato, Phædrus. Opera, p. 1211.

urged Marmontel[1] to visit Paris, "seule école du gout où peut se former le talent." In towns there is every opportunity of improvement; the mind of each is multiplied by the intelligence of all. What a fond wandering creature is a rural genius in our times! We have seen a politician, a poet, and a preacher, who lived and loitered in the fields, and made vertigo their divinity. In general, country-people continue their prejudices longer than their fashions, in which they are always unfashionable. They not only want taste but knowledge; they cannot know, for they have not seen, have not heard. Thus while France generally had escaped from the bondage of *le grand monarque* at Paris, and the monarch at Rome, the inhabitants of the Bocage,—where there is no great town, few small ones, and little intercourse,—worshipped their priests, and adored the Bourbons as fervently as the English Jacobites did James the Second.

Though I favour cities, I object to every prerogative, privilege, and favour towards them. The seat of government unavoidably collects many: but when a court and an accredited nobility are superadded, the evil is increased without any countervailing advantage. These great proprietors distress each other in efforts of prodigality. The rents of their tenants[2] are

[1] Memoires, t. 1. p. 162.

[2] Sir J. Steuart says, "The high price of most things in large cities is surely a benefit, not a loss, to the country." vol. 1. p. 54. Every one has heard of a fête by such a one, and the claim on the tenants to pay up, to enable the master to provide the fête: What good is this to the country? A hundred tenants are pressed to sell their grain prematurely, that the proprietor may produce fifty dishes of insipid things out of season.

raised, to supply their senseless profusion; their lands are mortgaged; and thus those who rivalled the prince in waste, become paupers—eventually state paupers and royal parasites. This happens without one atom of good, without a memorial of their folly. Yet I remember one: a commander of the forces in Ireland, Sir John Irwin (I note the idiot's name for the honour of all great captains), exhibited at an entertainment to the Lord Lieutenant, the siege of Gibraltar in confectionary, which cost 1500*l*.

The flocking of seigneurs to the city is a pernicious increase to the capital; and Sully was sincere in wishing that the noblesse should live on their domains[1]. Yet the evil was as necessary in that monarchy, as absentees from Ireland under the double exhaustion of a foreign monarchy and an expatriated legislature.

Another cause of increasing illegitimately the capital of England, is the national debt. The funds oblige a large portion of the population to reside in the capital; and this for various reasons.

Another cause of the increase of London is the concentration of the East Indian trade, which alone is supposed to occupy 50,000 persons. Had this accumulation originated in the absolute liberty of commerce, which swelled the trade of Leghorn; or had it arisen from the lowness of the customs, which increased the commerce of the United Provinces,—there

[1] Il desiroit sur-tout que la noblesse habitât dans ses terres. Thomas, Eloges, t. 3. p. 340. Mezeray says of this minister, He retrenched in his office all little tricks and projects, and made it appear that to discharge his office there was only wanting diligence and a knowledge of vulgar arithmetic. Anno 1599.

could be no objection to it; the abundance would then have been a boon: but on the contrary it depended on a monopoly.

London is a great manufacturing town; and this has been effected in some cases by favouritism. Indeed towns have been specially favoured at the expense of the country. The 25th of Henry the Eighth enacted that cloth should be manufactured only in certain towns, which was intended to prevent country tradesmen from exerting their industry. The corporations which were opened in the former reign, were reclosed[1], and they continue so. These are the principal causes of the excessive increase of London. Yet it does not now bear a greater relative proportion to the state than it did in Davenant's time[2], if he were accurate, who computed its inhabitants at a tenth of the whole kingdom.

Cities have originated in superstition[3], and many have been enlarged by its operation; as Mecca, Jerusalem, &c. The Jews were obliged to come to Jerusalem[4] three times a-year, to thank God, and to maintain a friendly correspondence with one another. Such congregations were not unknown in Egypt. Herodotus[5] speaks of one at Bubastis, where seven hundred thousand people beside children assembled.

[1] Hume, vol. 4. p. 279. [2] Works, vol. 1. p. 52.

[3] Niebuhr. Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 10. p. 75.

[4] Josephus, lib. 4. c. 8. There is a sort of a New Jerusalem at Tromsoe. Many of the parishioners have fifty English miles to travel to hear divine service. Every proprietor in the parish has a wooden hut near the church, where he resides with his family during his devotion.

[5] lib. 2. c. 60.

Such is Benares, where the rajahs have resident ambassadors purposely to perform ablutions, &c.

If such be onerous and absurd, the custom of sacrificing the provinces to the capital is not less pernicious. Constantinople, which arose out of the ruins of the world, is supported by general depredation. When it wants provisions, says Volney [1], ten provinces are famished to afford it a supply. In Paris, it has been the practice to sell bread cheaper than the true price; the government, that is the nation, affording the means of this partiality.

Neither should any general tax be imposed, nor should any sums be diverted from the public funds to supply the capital with accommodations, as for constructing water-works and the like; nor with theatrical exhibitions, as at ancient Rome, and which is now common in all the capitals of the continent: the theatre at Copenhagen is said to cost the state 60 or 70,000 dollars. Nor should the public money be employed in building churches. The chancellor of the exchequer menaced the nation with applying the public money to build churches in the city. This is to make the Protestant church something more than a national establishment; and is in every view a gross perversion of public property. If the people of London want churches, why do they not provide them themselves? Are they not able? Are not the members of the Protestant church established by law far more opulent than Dissenters, who are barely tolerated?

[1] Voyage en Syrie, t. 2. p. 237. See Thornton also, vol. 2. p. 23.

Yet the Dissenters—the rejected—without property or honour or office, out of their proper funds have raised more temples of worship than those of the national establishment, whose sons possess all things. Yet this is not all:—Why should churches be built by the nation for the London clergy? James the First[1] declared, "The sickness and decay of all churches since the beginning of the world, have been pride, ambition, and avarice:" and he was right. And Dr. Hickes spoke also truly, "I would never have any clergyman govern himself by the practice of the clergy in London, where I may say as Justinian said of Rome—"Non quæ Romæ facta tam spectanda sunt quam quæ fieri debent." The purpose of Mr. Vansittart, which for that session was defeated by the misery of the finances, was iniquitous. This Christian chancellor of the exchequer should take a lesson from the Turkish law, which does not permit the sultan to appropriate to pious uses any part of the money consecrated to the necessities of the state[2]. Nothing should be built or supported in the capital at the nation's expense, which was not directly national.

[1] Basilikon Doron, p. 38.

[2] Thornton's State of Turkey, vol. 2. p. 44.

CHAPTER IV.

Population neither forced nor defrauded not alarming—population to be encouraged—how—natives and foreigners admitted absolute liberty of entry and egress.—Iniquitous conduct of the English government.—Error of Gibbon on the policy of some ancient states, Roman, Athenian, &c. respecting their increasing their population from abroad.—All not criminals to have the same right to labour, and trade, and sojourn—foreigners not to possess civil authority, except in extraordinary cases.

I DO not fear population which is not forced nor defrauded; I fear bad government, conquest, and its consequences. Why should a nation's inhabitants,—I speak not of individuals,—overbreed their resources? The power of communicating life must always be controlled among rational beings, not by vice and misery, but by intelligence, by self-interest: selfishness alone would anticipate the summary destruction by vice and misery, unless we conclude that the human kind are among the lowest animals, worse than summer-flies, whose noisome offspring quicken amidst putrefaction, and perish amidst the ruin of their birth. I favour population as a proof (unless under peculiar circumstances) of good laws, or rather of laws and government not intolerable. As I favour population, I would promote the increase of men by an equitable distribution of property, by equal and authentic laws, an œconomical and a prompt distribution of justice; and by a constitution founded on common consent and universal utility, embracing each man's power, and all men's sagacity. As for the direct means of populating, which I have enumerated, by penalties, by bounties, immunities, and the like, I should as soon

recommend Hermes Trismegistus, or advocate the *multiplying* of gold and silver.

Let the lowest species of labour be uncontrolled, and all the prime necessaries of life be untaxed; let each man labour when and where and at what rate he pleases, and let him look to his own exertions for his maintenance: until this be done, society is bound to provide for the wanting in their distress. The government has made the people what they are: and having distorted them to their fancy, they must continue to support them; as they trained them to dependence, they must uphold them. Every man should be perfect master of his time, his motions, and his labour; and the lowest labourers should be exonerated from every charge, directly or indirectly, on their food, clothes, and accommodations. If these be taxed, the tax must be returned in some way; or manufacturers and labourers must decline, and ultimately disappear.

The first concern in every state should be the labouring people; they should be free to adopt any profession in any place that suited their ability and wishes. This liberty should be granted to natives, and to all people. I am equally against soliciting foreigners, or repelling them: to repel the stranger, is only less hideous than banishing citizens iniquitously:—it may be worse, as it is a breach of hospitality. It was a dogma of pagan charity, "The stranger and the poor are from Jove."

To repel strangers is churlish, cowardly, andsavage. The greatest barbarity is to kill strangers. Such it attributed to the Scythians [1], who, it is said, sacrificed

[1] Philostratus Tyan. Vita, lib. 6. c. 20.

them to Diana; and to Busiris, an Egyptian king, who wished to render his country inaccessible by such outrages. The next is the seizure of strangers, and enslaving them. Adelan had advanced beyond this stage; as Bruce[1], on offering him a present, said, "I will not refuse it, but it is quite unnecessary. I have faults like other men, but to hurt or ransom strangers was never one of them." Are we thence to infer, that presents from strangers are a compromise for forfeited freedom[2]? The next step, if it should not have preceded the former, is the utter rejection of foreigners. The Galla[3] admit no strangers to live among them: and the Abyssinians, while they admit them, resist their return[4]. The Chinese suffer the entry of foreigners with great difficulty and various precautions, and it appears that they utterly exclude women. Bell[5], who was attached to the Russian embassy by land, says, that as it was about to pass the frontiers, the conductor, on seeing some women in the fields, said "they had women enough at Pekin already; and as there never had been an European woman in China, he could not admit them without a special order from the emperor." What was a surmise of the Chinese conductor is law in Japan. Tombe says, that on a ship approaching Japan, it is visited in order to ascertain that it does not con-

[1] Travels, vol. 5. p. 193.

[2] I fear that it is not a mere conjecture. Barrow mentions, that at Tonqueen, strangers, to free themselves from the exactions of insolent courtiers, become adopted by some potent citizen, to whom they make presents, &c. Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 9. p. 668.

[3] Bruce, vol. 2. p. 407.

[4] Bruce, vol. 2. p. 287.

[5] In Pinkerton's Travels, vol. 7. p. 365.

tain women or books[1], "for the approach of any woman, or the introduction of any book into this island, is severely prohibited by law." This we call monstrous: and yet there was an English law, which prohibited, not the entry, but the exit of women, because they were popishly inclined[2]. And in the Scotch law, Mackenzie mentions, among crimes punished arbitrarily, "bringing home of erroneous books, and the troublers of churchmen[3]." This miserable jealousy is confined to particular places in particular countries. The sanctuary at Mecca is reserved for the eyes of believers: and respecting Constantinople, "no foreigner is allowed to reside in the city itself, not even the minister of a friendly nation[4]."

No nation has exhibited more caprice and contradiction than the English, in respect to populating from abroad. While foreign artificers were encouraged by law[5], as by the 14th and 15th Henry VIII., strangers using any handicraft, whether denizen or not, were prohibited from taking an apprentice, or having more than two journeymen, unless they were natural-born

[1] The books, I suppose, regard religion. The entry and translation of such books are censured by the emperor of China in Sir G. T. Staunton's Chinese Code. When Langsdorff was at Japan, all acts of religious worship by the embassy were prohibited.

[2] I quote this on the authority of the late Lord Stanhope's speech, July 3, 1812, who knew more of law than the House of Lords all together. If I mistake not, he alone protested against the last war, when England was free to determine.

[3] Institutions, &c. p. 390.

[4] Hobhouse's Travels, p. 824. This, he says, is not of ancient usage, but of modern policy.

[5] Reeves's Hist. English Law, vol. 4. p. 229.

subjects: that is, foreign artisans were requested to enter, but they were disabled from teaching their sons their profession. By the 25th of the same king, and re-enacted by the 33d, c. 4, strangers born were excluded from working in pewter. Nonsense, absurdity, and contradiction; whether these laws regarded peopling, or promoting domestic industry. Again, by the 13th Geo. II. c. 3. foreign seamen serving two years upon proclamation in time of war were naturalized; and by 2 Geo. II. c. 39. foreign protestants serving two years in America were naturalized also. Yet with these efforts to win the service of foreign soldiers and sailors, England continues the most hideous of all conscriptions—pressing,—which incites British sailors to abandon their country for any other; for none can be more hostile to man's interest and dignity, than the British government is to the safe and sincere defenders of the empire.

Later times have brought a no less serious charge against the hospitality of England. Some years since, about the time that the crown and judicature achieved their joint exploits against Muir and Palmer, when military torture was exercised in Ireland on many,—for which some were nobly paid, and Judkin Fitzgerald knighted[1],—Napper Tandy fled from Ireland to Hamburg; and contrary to the law of nations he was demanded from that submissive city, and seized, forced back to Ireland, and capitally condemned. In this spirit the war was pursued at home; and in the temper it began it has ended. By a system of outrage and

[1] Verres did not worse;—yet how did Cicero dwell on one Roman citizen being beaten!

lying, the English ministry helped to re-impose a Bourbon on the French throne[1], contrary to their proclaimed intention and the manifest wishes of the French people. To support this measure, certain individuals were to be abandoned to the vengeance of the intruding government. To this universal hostility against a few men; to this eagerness of crowned heads to seize and commit to the vengeful enemy,—compare the conduct of the town of Rotterdam, respecting Charles the Second's demand, through his minister, for the apprehension of Joyce, who had seized Charles the First at Holdenby, and carried him to the army. But Holland, though verging to a monarchy, was still a republic: it was then as were the free states of Greece, which equally increased in power and people by their easy access and general humanity. Temple[2] specifies, among the causes of Holland's extensive population, "the esteem in which it has passed, of being a refuge to men miserable at home, or persecuted by their own government."

How different is England now that she has leagued with despots[3]! Certain miserable men shall live only in the three great military prisons, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. To this she has re-enacted the alien

[1] Let no one suppose that I favour Bonaparte; I always abhorred him. He did much good; but he would just as soon have done evil, if such would have served his selfish views. The friends of our ministry are Bonaparte's associates:—both hold no sympathy with mankind.

[2] Works, vol. 2. p. 439.

[3] It is in common hatred of liberty. The patriots of South America were refused protection by the English officers at Curaçoa and Trinidad,—which they found from Petion.

bill. The confederacy of the magnanimous allies has reduced the people of Europe to that lamentable state, under which it laboured during the Roman empire, when all men were linked together by one chain. The triumphant comparison by Gibbon between modern and ancient Europe has ceased; while the eulogium on the British,—that by Magna Charta they made the freedom of foreigners a portion of domestic liberty,—has become, by the alien bill, a stinging reproach. Yet let it be remembered, that the alien bill preceded but a little the bill for the suspension of the habeas corpus; and if in ancient times the barons made the rights of strangers and natives a common cause, their substitutes at present have attainted the rights of both together.

The alien bill is contrary to Magna Charta, to the 27th Edward the Third, which ensured to merchant strangers and others free entry, a safe sojourn, and an easy return. Why should the pride of Englishmen be so sadly humbled? Lord Liverpool the minister said, "it was not safe that Great Britain should be overrun with foreigners." Yet the amount of this overwhelming body was, according to the computation of Mr. H. Addington, (one of the warmest advocates of the bill,) not more than twenty thousand individuals; a number considerably less than the foreign mercenaries in England, who are employed by the crown contrary to the laws of the land and all laws of prudence; as foreign mercenaries ever have been, and must be, the satellites of despotism. This alien bill (the perniciousness of which no man can apprehend who knows not the jeopardy and terror

with which it struck foreigners) was re-enacted in peace, when all the European powers were banded against one man and his baffled and expatriated adherents. Amidst songs of triumph on the 31st of May, 1816, it was passed, on the same day that in the committee of supply 40,000*l.* were voted by the titular representatives of the commons of the empire to the royalist emigrants from France. What a perversion of honour and interest! To prevent the possible entry of a few French unfriendly to the Bourbons, the British ministry obliged their creatures in parliament to subvert the national institutions and stifle the calls of humanity. At the very time that the British nation was menaced with insolvency, and while the ministry rejected the emigrants of one French party, it received and pensioned those of another;—it continued to pension the royalist emigrants, when their king of kings was restored. Excellent ministry! triumphant people! who fought for twenty-five years that a Bourbon might reign, and succeeded by chance, at the expense of honour, truth, and national solvency. There never was an act more disgraceful, more unfeeling, more dastardly and despotic, than this; and it substantiates an observation of Montesquieu, whom the overweening English love to quote, That the English, should they lose their liberty, will be among the most degraded slaves on the earth[1], most degraded! Rome, when basest[2], refused to return the

[1] S'ils venoient à la (liberté) perdre, ils seroient un des peuples des plus esclaves de la terre. liv. 2. c. 4. Esprit des Loix.

[2] Socrates Scholasticus, lib. 7. c. 18.

refugees from Persia, though claimed by the Persian king.

Having spoken so much on the generous and just conduct of nations respecting the admission of people from abroad, I wish to notice an error of Gibbon; and certainly not so much to disabuse the reader of his pages, as to redeem the injured from unmerited censure, and to advance a liberal policy among nations. The historian of the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" says: "The narrow policy of preserving without foreign mixture the pure blood of the ancient citizens, had checked the fortune and hastened the ruin of Athens and Sparta. The aspiring genius of Rome sacrificed vanity to ambition; and deemed it more prudent, as well as honourable, to adopt virtue and merit for her own, wheresoever they were found—among slaves or strangers, enemies or barbarians." This is one of those ambitious passages in which extremes are violently associated, and truth ingloriously sacrificed to effect.

The exceeding hospitality of the Romans, and afterward their undistinguishing reception of strangers, are problematical;—the first in fact, the latter in policy. On the authority of Cicero [1], among the ancient Ro-

[1] t. 4. p. 345. Park comparing the Moors and the Arabs:—This wandering and restless way of life, while it inures them to hardships, strengthens at the same time the bonds of their little society, and creates in them an aversion towards strangers which is almost insurmountable. Travels, p. 159. What was Romulus, and his troop? Gika, the present king of the Caffres, was surprised when he was remonstrated with for the murder of the shipwrecked Englishmen. He said he could not understand any impropriety in the act; as, being strangers, they had no more right

mans *enemy* was equivalent to *stranger*: "Hostis apud majores nostros nunc peregrinum dicimus." The facility of incorporation is also questionable, when we reflect that the plebeians were prohibited from connecting themselves with patrician families. Did not the Lex Fusia Caninia and the Lex Ælia Sentia, &c. designedly obstruct the manumission of slaves? And was not the Social war caused by the indisposition of the Romans to admit the people of Italy to the fellowship of the Roman state? These at last won their right by force, and were distributed into eight new tribes[1]. So much for one portion of Gibbon's praise of Roman policy. They afterward, it is true, did admit promiscuously all descriptions of people[2]. But how did their conduct deserve his encomium respecting their adoption of *virtue* and *merit*? Cicero[3] laments that the right of citizenship was granted not only to individuals but to provinces and nations. Dion of Halicarnassus says[4], it was conferred on robbers and prostitutes, and on every wretch. This exhibits in a lively manner the adoption of *virtue* and *merit* wherever they were found. to enter his country than wolves. The Missionary account says, Gika was estimable in many respects.

[1] For security to the old, after whom they gave the votes, &c. Paterculus, lib. 2. p. 20.

[2] Data cunctis promiscue civitas Romana. Aurelius Victor de Cæsaribus, p. 133.

[3] t. 2. p. 602. 50.

[4] Οἱ μεν ἀπολησειας και τοιχωρυχιας και πορνειας και παντος αλλου πονηρου χρηματισαμενοι, &c. lib. 4. c. 24. Dion Cassius says, This right, which was once sold so high, might now be obtained for a trifle. lib. 60. c. 17.

As well might he praise the armies of Rome, when they were composed of foreign mercenaries [1], of Carthaginians [2], of Gauls, Syrians, &c. The fact is, that when Rome became *colluvies omnium gentium*, (a miscellany of the refuse of mankind,) it reverted to its original inanity—"imaginem urbis magis quam urbem fecerat: incolæ deerant [3]."

In Gibbon's contrast of the Greeks, he is equally erroneous. The Spartans adopted slaves by hundreds; to incorporate foreigners they were averse, as were the Megareans, who boasted that they never admitted any one except Hercules and Alexander. But, generally speaking, the Greeks were free in communicating the *city* to men of desert [4]: and with respect to the Athenians, the historian's contrast is absolutely fantastic. Buzyges, who taught the use of the plough at Athens, execrated those who did not receive foreigners with hospitality [5]. Hospitality was praised by Theophrastus [6]; and Strabo enumerates this virtue, especially in his eulogy of the Athenians [7]. They enrolled the refugee Platæans [8], they incorporated the Gephyreans [9] whom the Bœotians had ex-

[1] Tacitus, Annal. lib. 3. c. 40.

[2] Herodian speaks of a Carthaginian who was consul. lib. 7. c. 377.

[3] Florus, lib. 1. c. 1.

[4] Cicero pro Archia Poeta, t. 2. p. 387.

[5] Or, who did not show the way to one wandering. Petit, L. Att. p. 557.

[6] Recte etiam in Theophrasto est laudata hospitalitas. Cic. t. 4. p. 383.

[7] Athenienses autem, sicuti reliquis in rebus, hospitium et externorum studiosi perstiterunt, &c. lib. 10. t. 2. p. 53.

[8] Auger's Lysias, p. 70.

[9] Herodotus, lib. 5. c. 57.

patriated: they admitted not only individuals but tribes. Thucydides says[1], that formerly the Athenians were free in conferring the right of citizenship: but he adds, it has been otherwise, latterly, on account of the multitude. Observe the progress of the Athenian and Roman states: Rome lost its people as it advanced, and no means could recruit them; while the Athenians so increased that they were obliged to limit their accustomed generosity;—for liberty declined at Rome as it advanced at Athens. Though the Athenians through necessity became select in their incorporation of foreigners, they always with alacrity cherished the votaries of popular liberty; and were not less exemplary for being a common refuge for the miserable, than being the resort of philosophy, literature, and all the arts.

On the topic of entertaining foreigners with reference to population, it is obvious that in new planted countries every facility and encouragement should of course be granted to settlers: but as the population thickens, the want being remedied, the same facility should not be continued. I object to all prerogatives granted to strangers in any circumstances. It is said that Ferdinand, to encourage the silk manufactures, placed foreign artificers on the same footing as native Italians, and that they should *be sued only before their own consuls*. This, Giannone[2] says, induced many artificers to resort to Naples; and in 1480 he pursued the same course with respect to workers in woollen; and that one half of the inhabitants of Naples was supported by the profits of these manufac-

[1] lib. 1. c. 3. [2] Storia de Napoli, lib. 27. p. 336.

tures. The propriety of this is doubtful, though it succeeded. Besides, it supposes a bad native government, for which I do not write: for, were the government equitable, would not this be sufficiently attractive to artisans? I would not even invite professors of the liberal arts, as Julius Cæsar[1] did, by granting them, as of course, the privileges of citizens. The masters in the liberal arts are surely among the most distinguished, yet an ingenious man may be a bad citizen.

Is it not obvious that all prerogatives granted to strangers prejudice the native citizen, and are a sort of fraudful solicitation of foreigners to abandon their country? The practice of England to gain sailors during a war, by the promise of naturalizing them, is of problematical advantage, and of course it causes re-action. Neither was the conduct of Lysander creditable; who proposed to increase the pay of the sailors in order to induce the mariners to withdraw from the Athenian fleets. Pericles treated a similar attempt as "a weak device of the enemy[2]." What! said that statesman and orator, do you fear they will abandon us for a few days' pay? Yet this was a temptation: but the promise of naturalization in England as a boon seems egregiously absurd. Why should a foreign sailor wish to become even a native British sailor, who is subjected to the harshest of all conscriptions? I have seen a petition of one (not a sailor) in this country to be disnaturalized.

I also particularly object to sudden and mighty incorporations; though it is said the 200,000 Egyp-

[1] Suetonius, lib. 1. c. 43. [2] Thucydides, lib. 1. p. 96.

tians who settled in Ethiopia civilized it[1]; and though there are other accounts of wonders performed for nations by accessions of foreigners. It is to be remarked, that foreigners are less prolific, and more subject to complaints, than natives. It is so in Russia[2]; and in the West Indies, it may here be remarked, that a country-born negro or negress is valued at double one imported[3].

It should be considered that a good citizen must possess peculiar knowledge, must be acquainted with the laws and institutions of the country:—How can a stranger obtain this intelligence? I speak not of a necessary defectiveness in the love of country in new-adopted citizens; for that affection which is not founded in knowledge is a blindfold passion. How are those who possess the right of granting admission to understand his pretensions? For these reasons, the most liberal nations have required a period of apprenticeship or probation preparatory to civil incorporation. Few, however, have been satisfied with mere residence. The Venetian laws required three years' abode[4]—"Firmum domicilium et habitationem cum familia"—to be assured by the state only; that is, to a right of residence. The French, when most disposed to profuse hospitality and excess in all things, required five years' residence in the republic:—"Et qui en outre ont épousé une Française ou acquit un

[1] Theagenes et Chariclea, p. 206.

[2] Tooke says that stillborn children of native women in Russia are seven in a thousand; of foreign women fifteen in a thousand. History, vol. 1. p. 540.

[3] Steele and Dickson, &c. p. 160. [4] De Statutis Venet. p. 263.

immeuble, ou formé un établissement de commerce, ou obtenu dans quelque ville des lettres de bourgeoisie, sont reputés Français[1]." The Athenians in the strength of the commonwealth had various degrees of association; all were entertained who came, all were secured: but they had domiciliated strangers, to whom were assigned guardians or patrons to protect them, and to secure the state[2]. A person to be a citizen must have been a native by father and mother; and no one could be naturalized who had not transferred himself and family for ever to Athens[3]. He must have had considerable pretensions, either as an artist, (επι τεχνη[4],) or as having been a public benefactor[5]; he must also have been first admitted by the senate, and his admission confirmed by six thousand Athenians. Nations cannot be too circumspect in adopting foreigners as active citizens. There is a medium to be respected between those kings of Egypt who repulsed all, and Psammetichus who adopted all. All persons should be entertained who conduct themselves becomingly; all professions should be open to their industry; and all should have liberty of trade and commerce: but to interfere with political matters, this should not be granted except in rare and extraordinary cases. Length of residence may justify the admission to minor interests, but for the higher they must be incompetent[6].

[1] Decret du 30 Avril 1790. Code Français, partie 2. p. 280.
[2] Petit, L. Att. p. 170. [3] Ibid. p. 129. [4] Ibid. p. 425.
[5] Ibid. p. 130.
[6] Thus there are various distinctions in our laws; alien friends, —denizens—naturalized. So among other nations, the Athenians, the Jews, &c. some strangers were "hospites justitiæ," who were

The conclusion I draw on this point, relative to population, is the same respecting every other topic connected with this subject,—that good government will be sufficiently attractive.

CHAPTER V.

No cause of fearing over-populousness.—Should people exceed, why not migrate?—Mr. Malthus.—Colonizing.—India,—the effects of that country on the commerce and opulence of Great Britain.—The British in India, and on their return.—The monstrous and confused government of British India.—Its ruinous effects in India.—The remedy suggested to convert the Hindoos to Christianity.—The government despotic; yet considered, particularly by Sir W. Jones, as necessary, and appointed by Providence.—The vices of the Asiatics referable to their governments.—The Asiatics equal to the Europeans proved, by examples from ancient and modern times.—The Hindoos no way peculiar—yet they must be treated as no other people ever were;—exemplified.—No colonization; no community of interest, language, &c.—What should be done in respect to India.—I no advocate for colonizing.—Colonies seldom succeed.—Losses by West Indian colonies to Great Britain.—If colonies be planted, to be treated with the utmost liberality.—Ancient opinions on that subject.

But may not a nation become too attractive, and thus become uncomfortably multitudinous? May not the people, as according to Mr. Malthus, over-breed, over-populate their means of subsistence? I have read

"pari jure cum Israelitis." Grotius de J. B. et Pacis, lib. 1. c. 1. § 16. A stranger by becoming a Jew lost all kindred with his Gentile relatives. Selden, c. 16. Circumcision was the formality of being admitted. In later times, among Christians, baptism. Gipseys induct their converts by rubbing or dyeing the face with walnut oil. Annual Register 1797, p. 128.

(and I wish to give Mr. Malthus and his school all the advantage they can derive from my reading) in Herodotus, of a people who were, in respect to their starving condition, not unlike the generations of men who now hugely press against the limits of subsistence. The historian says they were greatly oppressed by famine; that they sported and starved every other day alternately. "Thus they lived for the space of eighteen years: but when the calamity remitted nothing of its violence, but rather increased, the king divided the whole nation into two parts, one of which was to continue at home and the other to emigrate[1]." Why may not our reprobate people, if they be excessively numerous, pass abroad? Mr. Malthus indeed says[2], "Europe affords no resource by emigration, as its states *have nearly all rather a redundant than a deficient population*." Yet are all other quarters of the globe full? If Mr. Malthus thinks so, they are full to him as Banquo's chair was to Macbeth. The conduct of our wise men fixes the same belief on them, for they have adopted the last remedy—war; "which," Hobbes says, "provideth for every one by death or victory[3]." Theirs is the heroical check; it is of great antiquity and celestial descent. Wars, says Chrysippus[4], were instituted by Jupiter—the Saviour, the Generator, the father of *justice* and *peace*—in order to purge states of their population; and he quotes Euripides, who attributed the Trojan war to this necessary purgation. Could any theologian among the

[1] Herodotus, lib. 1. c. 94.
[2] vol. 2. p. 69.
[3] Leviathan, part 2. c. 30.
[4] Plutarch. Moral. p. 468.

modern Babel-builders comprise more contradictions in fewer words?

We have tried war; and whether it was entertained directly or indirectly against the people, it has been a remedy without a relief. Millions have been *killed off* (to use Mr. Windham's business-like expression), yet after twenty-five years' war we have not been comforted, nor have any of the belligerents gained *more food or room* by the general desolation.

I then ask, *if* we are over-populous, why do we not transplant our superfluous people? Plato furnishes a hint for transplanting a supernumerary population, and affording them at the same time the benefit of war. "Those," said he, "who through want of food are willing to enlist themselves under a leader, and to assail those who have abundance; let those deadly enemies of the state be expatriated under the honourable title of a colony[1]."

Of all countries, though many have vacillated in their colonial policy, the British have been most contradictory. They persecute or dishonour a large body of their subjects, yet obstruct their departure. In 1762[2] a proposal was made by certain Catholic lords to raise five regiments of Catholic Irish for the king of Portugal. This was resisted by the Irish parliament,—that is, by the English government,—while all means were employed to waste and exterminate the Catholics. Still the emigration of the Irish is obstructed. Some time since no American vessel could take more passengers from Ireland than one for every

[1] De Legib. lib. 5. p. 845. [2] Annual Register 1762, p. 76.

five tons burthen;—now I believe one passenger is assigned to every three tons. This, to be sure, was intended for the convenience of the Irish emigrants: and thus the government, which never performed a just act unforced to the Irish at home, watched over their accommodation in their farewell passage across the Atlantic. Yet observe, when the British government proposed transplanting Wurtemburgers to South Carolina, the advertisement for shipping rated the individuals according to the tons; and two hundred persons were the complement for a ship of two hundred tons[1]. It is difficult to say whether this is more iniquitous or absurd. The Irish are treated as no people so circumstanced ever were treated: persecuted at first, then rejected, always belied and scorned and pillaged. They are solicited to remain at home by accounts, fabricated by the authority of government or under its auspices, of the uncomfortable state of the laborious in America, while they are precluded by the ratios of tonnage and passengers. This conduct seems as much to spite the Americans as to harass the Irish. Yet the government wishes to encourage settlers in Canada[2]; and here again the Irish are discredited. In short, the Irish are only fit to live in Ireland, under martial law and the curfew, and hear praises of their inimitable constitution.

This is one instance of the contradiction of the British government; and their foreign policy is a suite of similar outrages. England, which has been as fond of colonizing as its gentry of travelling, (for which I

[1] Annual Register 1760, p. 195.

[2] Strachan's Letters to Lord Selkirk.

sincerely honour them,) granted permission to Captain Beaver to colonize Bulama; yet the colony was prevented from sailing, though every step to its final equipment was undertaken with the knowledge of Mr. Pitt, because a *constitution* for the colony was framed and published for the management of the settlers. Captain Beaver says[1], that the government had no objection to the sailing of the colonists without any constitution. Thus it appears that a constitution was as alarming as Jacobinism; the friends of social order dreaded a new constitution at Bulama, and actually preferred anarchy to the chance of order.

As the French revolution had thus paralysed the brave and stupified the wise, American independence effected a counter policy in Britain to Asia. Formerly England, when she ruled America, adopted every mode to increase its population: so late as the 13th of George the Second, foreigners were invited to the American colonies by a law naturalizing them after a residence of seven years[2]; and for the same purpose lots of land were granted to sailors, soldiers, and officers, in 1763. Sir W. Young[3] not inaptly characterized the British government in saying, "I know of no instance of a Spaniard, Portuguese, or Dutchman, colonizing other than national settlements; but the English seem colonizing mad—they would colonize for the French, for the Dutch, for all the world:" and they continue this phrensy. Having possessed Gibraltar, they must make another step in advance.

[1] African Memoranda, p. 18 and 19.

[2] Annual Register, 1763, p. 21.

[3] Colonial Common Place Book, p. 182.

Malta falls to them in the grand bustle. This is called our bulwark in the Mediterranean. This bulwark is again dependent on other countries for provisions, to secure which different writers have advised England to possess itself of Sicily. England is obliged, however, to be contented with patronizing the Ionian Isles, and increasing its strength, by extending its dominions; and its resources, by adding to its expenditure: but then they increase patronage [1], and employ an army of 10,000 men.

In another direction the English have been equally apt to colonize. How many British settlements there are at this side of the Cape of Good Hope, which is called our *grand outwork of India*; and how many more on the other side, on the way to the *work* itself, it is unnecessary to enumerate: but in India the passion of colonizing is neutralized. In India no colony can be planted; and no Briton, generally speaking, is admissible. Then why rail at the jealousy of the Spaniards respecting the South American dependencies, which their timid policy happily cannot secure? or at the precautions of the Chinese? for the conduct of the British is more suspicious and dastardly than both. It is worse than that of the Sodomites [2], one of whose crimes was hatred of strangers; for the British government in India is averse to their own countrymen, and repels them. Lee Lewes was sent back from India by Lord Cornwallis in 1788, because he had not obtained the special permission of the Court of Directors at London.

[1] Austria enjoys every trading advantage possessed by England.

[2] Josephus, lib. 1. c. 11.

We are told that the Anglo-Indian government is wonderful. Yes, truly! a few merchant-adventurers obtained the privilege of a factory, which China will not grant to our fraternizing government; and Bombay became held of the English crown by the East India Company, as *part of the manor of East Greenwich in the county of Kent*; just as beyond the Atlantic a portion of the world is reputed, if I mistake not, part of the see of London. Wonderful truly! and thus sixty millions of people in the opposite hemisphere are possessed by two thousand individuals in England, whose right of dominion consists in their possession of ten millions commercial capital, which sum does not equal one-third of their debts; that is, in right of a bankruptcy of more than twenty millions, two thousand insolvents, called proprietors of stock, command 380,000 square miles, and sixty millions of people.

This oligarchy elect twenty-four directors, six of whom vacate their places annually by rotation. Over these, or under them, (for they are like Trinculo in his viceroyalty,) is the Board of Control [1]. This arrangement may be called the maximum of British sagacity; as by it the happy balance of the constitution is

[1] This famous Board (Mr. Creevey says) while he was secretary, for fourteen months, did not meet, nor had there been a Board for twenty-two years before. Yet the Earl of Buckinghamshire, 12th July 1814, chairman of the Board, sent to the chairman of the East India Company, suggesting that pensions of 5,000*l.* a-year should be granted to the Marquis of Wellesley and Lord Melville; and that Lord Melville's debts, 20,000*l.*, should be paid:—and all this as contrary to law, and to the nature of a Board of Control, as a curb is to a spur.

trimmed with improved felicity. For, said Mr. Pitt and his party, if the patronage of India be granted according to Mr. Fox's bill, the minister would be greater than the crown. And anon, said Lord Castlereagh in his circumlocutories, if the crown possessed the patronage of India, this would be dangerous to our liberties. How interested for liberty! Hear this, his country, Ireland—and Norway, and Genoa, and Italy, and Ragusa, and Europe. This very man, who had been convicted of exchanging a place in India for a seat in parliament for his creature Lord Clancarty, talks thus, and is endured! When did not the ministry command the patronage of India? General Smith, before the existence of the Board of Control, stated, "it was notorious that for years past there had not been a single appointment in India which was not managed by ministers[1]." And Lord Melville, in 1806, affirmed in the House of Lords, that the exercising at pleasure the power of recalling the governors of India, *enabled his majesty's ministers to gain the entire patronage of India.* Yet we shall be told, India is not dangerous to our liberties; and that Pitt's bill, or Castlereagh's bill, operates as a patent engine to suspend India between the Gothic scales of our surprising constitution. What a world is this, when Lord Castlereagh, whose merit consists in a subterfuge for talents, can deprive matter of its weight and man of his passions! Then say, that falling bodies, which hitherto have declined to the *East*, as they partook of the rotary motion of the earth, fall plump down,—for a wise and veracious minister said so.

[1] Parliamentary Debates, 1781, p. 404.

Much praise has been justly given to the resolutions of the Commons in 1782, which were followed by corresponding resolutions by the Court of Directors; and to the acts of parliament of 1784 and 1793, which decided, "that to pursue schemes of conquest and extension of dominion in India, are measures repugnant to the wish, the honour and the policy of this nation[1]." Yet what has been the consequence? Though the law required that no hostile measures even of preparation or alliance should be effected, before the territories of the Company were attacked; yet every successive war has been waged in utter contempt of such laws and orders. Indeed, Sir John Malcolm stoutly affirms, that India has been saved by disobeying them. Thus Hastings, Cornwallis, Wellesley, and the rest, have constantly disregarded the home government and the imperial law: yet amidst this mighty disobedience, how exactly they followed the orders of their employers, when Lee Lewes, a poor player, was not permitted to fret his hour on the stage, but was rejected from India, as had he sinned against Louis and legitimacy! Thus has the government in India proceeded from war to conquest; from violence to spoliation; from interference to absolute dominion. But (say the friends of the Company) the acquisition of territory has been *forced*

[1] It was also stated by the court of France, long since: "Il seroit avantageux que les compagnies de deux nations aux Indes Orientales s'abstenissent à jamais de toutes vues militaires et de conquêtes, pour se restreindre et s'entr'aider dans les vues de commerce qui leur sont propres," &c. Mably, Droit Publ. t. 3. p. 274.

on them. This is just the *suite d'évènemens*[1] of which the French East India Company spoke, and on which Bonaparte acted. It is difficult to understand the morality of that government, whose existence depends on universal domination. Sir John Malcolm speaks intelligibly in saying, It was gained by the sword, and by the sword we must maintain it.

As at home, the Directors and the Board of Control divide the civil authority over India. India is ruled by two incongruous military forces, the Company's and the King's; the partiality shown to one of them occasions enmity, jealousy, and dissension. Yet because the King appoints the commander of his troops, and the Directors nominate the commander of theirs, the eulogists of "things as they are," insist that this was wisely conceived, for it does not *halve* the responsibility, but *doubles* it. Perhaps, as we have heard of the ingenious mode of preventing the patronage in India from affecting even-handed Justice, who always holds the balance of our wonderful constitution, these adverse military establishments operate as the centrifugal and centripetal forces on the planetary system. At all events we are told the government is good;—that of this there can be no doubt, for it has been successful. What has been its success? It has in half a century overrun a great tract of Asia. If this be a subject for moral gratulation, fall down before Alexander—raise a temple to Tamerlane—call the "locusts[2] warping on the Eastern wind," harbingers

[1] Mably, Droit Publique, t. 3. p. 347.

[2] Buchanan speaks of a flight of locusts three miles long, a hundred yards wide, and fifty feet thick: they overspread every thing.

of the divine presence; and the simoon the divinity itself, for it is swiftest of all created things, and its breath is destruction.—What has been the success of Britain in India?

First consider the individuals who pass to India. They go—but their object is to return. Yet it appears by official documents, that the mortality of the British in India was as eighty-three to one. Mr. Grant computes the present mortality as four out of five. Mr. Forbes is more detailed: In 1755 he went to India with seventy-four gentlemen: of these, in 1777, three only had returned to England with fortunes; forty-eight had died in India, of whom eight had acquired or were acquiring fortunes when they died; but twenty-five had died bankrupts; the other fifteen were in indifferent circumstances. Thence it appears that the chance of these fortune-hunters to return to England is desperate, and that two fail for one who succeeds; yet the chant and chorus is the riches derived from the East, because now and then a wealthy individual returns from India, who plants and drains, and builds, and levels;

"Diruit, ædificat, mutat quadrata rotundis."

If such incidents prove a boon to the nation, then was the assessment of the crown revenue in France a national gain; for farmers-general made the same exhibitions through France in a supereminent degree, as nabobs do in Britain. Calculate the expense of the rearing and education and the outfit of all those who escape to India; kill nine in ten of them; let two parts be bankrupt;—why the survivors who return to England

should have large fortunes, barely to indemnify the nation for the expenses and losses on all those who passed abroad and perished. Of those who escaped death and bankruptcy, and who return enriched, what joys do they feel or communicate? They have been unmade for Europe; they are puling valetudinarians, sickly and unsightly—a Lascar cast among the British people. So much for the Indian-British as individuals.—Let us now consider India in reference to Great Britain in its commercial relations.

The Directors asserted that their ships were excellent for the warlike defence of commerce: they were tried when William Pitt alarmed the English, and they were found insufficient. The Directors also insisted "that the trade of their company has been highly beneficial to the public, in affording a nursery for seamen in time of war." This,—if the Directors were capable of jesting,—might seem a satire on the law for burying in woollen, as serving the British staple:—this nursery for seamen is their grave.

The India trade the Directors have repeatedly declared to be a positive loss; and to such extent that it would be intolerable without the exclusive commerce with China being secured to the Company. Can such a system serve Great Britain? With respect to the China trade, the ordinary teas cost the Company from eight-pence a pound to two shillings at Canton [1]. Yet at what enormous prices are these teas sold in Great Britain and Ireland! The enhancement arises partly from the duty. This payment

[1] Barrow's China, p. 573.

into the exchequer the East India Company credits their trade: as if teas could only be had through their means; as if the duty was not paid by the British consumer; as if the enhancement of the price of teas was not in a considerable degree to support the ruinous Indian trade of the Company,—which, like all other companies, would lose, though private traders should gain. It is farcical to talk of the delicacy of regulating the Chinese trade. American republicans trade to Canton without a company: and there are reasons equal to the jealousy of the Chinese, why private traders would be better received than the servants of the East India Company. Yet we are told of the advantages which the nation derives from this Company, when the whole trade of Calcutta does not equal the present reduced trade of Bristol. These exaggerated statements have induced the continental writers to consider the East Indies the source of British opulence. Suppose the Indian trade employs 115,000 tons of shipping, navigated by 10,000 men. The ships rot, the men are destroyed, and the *produce* is confessedly a *loss*, for which loss the Company is indemnified by the exclusive commerce of China. Thus tea-drinkers are taxed to support the Company: and they are informed that the bad teas are not brought to market, but, sunk at the Nore. This is precisely the consolation afforded by the Fishmongers' Company: they, generous souls! are anxious that the London epicures should have nothing but the daintiest fish; yet it has been ascertained "that whatever fish arrive beyond

the extended demand of the fishmongers, *however fresh and good*[1], is thrown into the Thames and destroyed before it reaches Billingsgate."

We come now to the English in India[2]. Those who go abroad from England are boys[3], who have made some progress in a nondescript seminary between a school and a college. From scholastic extravagance of all kinds, they proceed directly to exercise absolute power in civil, military, and judicial departments over sixty millions of men; without any knowledge of man or government, and entirely ignorant of those whom they are deputed to manage. It was proposed to educate in India those intended to conduct the affairs of India: but this was negatived, principally lest the governors might thence acquire certain sympathies with the governed. Yet we are told by a Lord and traveller, of the blessedness of the East India Company's government. The eulogium is not unlike a Persian poet's address to Sir John Macpherson[4], "exalted as the sky, prosperous in thy undertakings, who like the sun receivest even atoms on thy beams. I have composed a poem in words of truth, beginning with a panegyric on the

[1] I do not mean to insinuate that the East India Company destroy their fresh teas: teas keep, and they supply the market to uphold the price.

[2] Mrs. Graham signifies that the white people in India are vulgar and ignorant. India, p. 134. The Quarterly Review says, The manners of the British are much changed for the worse. No. 23, p. 183.

[3] Aristotle holds that a young man may be a good mathematician, but not a good politician.

[4] Sir W. Jones's Life, p. 324.

Company." Some do not speak so poetically: Lord Cornwallis said the government of the East India Company "was sound and good for all practical purposes."—To the facts.

It is stated as an act of wonderful abstinence, that no European should possess lands in India. Nor could a Welshman formerly have purchased lands in the next English counties [1]. Yet who ever praised the generosity of this law? When the Athenians prohibited any Athenian from holding land beyond Attica [2], at the same time that they returned to the ancient proprietors all the land which they had conquered from them, they acted wisely, and were honoured for their disinterested conduct. But what relation has the British legislation to the Athenian? The non-appropriating interdict is part of the non-colonizing policy, and this proceeds from monstrous jealousy. The Indian British are not proprietors, but usufructuaries. Their conduct and their self-praise on this point resemble the egotism of the Jewish priesthood. The law was divided among the tribes; but *the tribe of Levi received no land, the Lord is their inheritance.* Yet mark the difference between the Levites and the British in India; the former received through godliness the largest share, but the British receive the half of the produce of the soil. Mr. Richards [3] made this statement in 1813

[1] 2 Henry IV. Law Dict. vol. 2. p. 755.

[2] Diod. Siculus, lib. 15.

[3] He said, (if the newspapers reported truly,) that the zemindars receive one half, that the government took 10-11ths of that half.

in the House of Commons. The self-denying ordinance, then, is merely an act begun in jealousy and ending in rapine. If this be the amount of their magnanimity,—what is the merit of the government in points which are not prominently displayed or distantly insinuated?

It is impossible that this government can be good; it is of foreigners, of boys who go abroad with the certainty of not settling in the place of their government, who leave their own country for the sole purpose of money-making, and who are induced by their greediness, and their suffering from the climate, to quicken their rapacity, that they may be enabled as soon as possible to recoil on Europe. The state of the country confirms the account: The government *broke promise* with the ryots[1], who are consigned to the mercy of zemindars—creatures between Irish agents and middlemen. The Company squeezes the zemindars, who, as in Ireland, double their snake-folds round the farmers; and as they had their flesh bruised, they break the bone. Take one characteristic specimen of the effects of this boasted government. Buchanan says, that in Bengal the crop cannot be cut till the rent is paid; and that in other places, though cut, it cannot be removed[2]: that is, the farmers are obliged to pay in advance; to insure which, the crop is of course distressed or impounded, to the danger of the whole crop or its injury:—in consequence, the people are literally ejected. Considering that men hardly live under better treatment, it is inconceivable how life is continued

[1] Tytler's State of India, Introduction, p. 16.

[2] Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 8. p. 574.

under such rapacity: every thing, however, declines; no new houses are building, and the old are in ruins. Tytler has specified many towns and villages that are in various gradations of dilapidation[1]. Buchanan[2], in his journal, says, "The country is exceedingly bare, and the population scanty; all the houses are collected in villages:—the smallest village of five or six houses is fortified[3]." Dacoity or gang-robbery is admitted universally to have increased. Thus it happens, that in Bengal, which Bernier[4] thinks the most productive country in the world,—and he specifies his reasons, where "less than half a penny procures enough of turmeric, spice, salt, and ghee, to season the whole rice eaten in a day by a labourer and his wife and five or six children; the vegetables and acids that he requires are found in every hedge[5];" even here, with this facility of living, this people, *mild, laborious, and patient,* says Niebuhr[6]: so patient, says Lord Va-

[1] Observations on India, vol. 1. p. 375 et seq.

[2] Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 8. p. 587. The favourers of the Company contrast their government with that of the Moguls. Suppose it better,—what merit could they derive from this comparison? It is certain that what is here said by Buchanan, is said by Bernier of the Mogul's territories. Pinkerton, &c. vol. 8. p. 135. Forster says the same of Persia, when most wretched; that the smallest hamlets are surrounded with walls, as a shelter against robbery. Ibid. vol. 9. p. 308.

[3] Yet Lord Hastings said in his last speech at the College of Calcutta, "We have reared the bulwark of security round the humble hovels of the helpless." Times Newspaper, January 17, 1818. Thus his lordship re-edits St. Pierre's Chaumiere Indienne;—all is less secure, crimes increase as the population has become more poor.

[4] Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 8. p. 226.

[5] Graham's India. [6] Travels, c. 155.

lentia, that during the whole of the great famine[1] they permitted the grain to pass through their villages to Poonah, though their inhabitants were perishing with hunger;....yet this people, in this productive country, are forced into gangs of robbers, and the population and cities disappear: this is the *blessed* government, *good for all practical purposes*. We talk of Negroland, and Huggins and Hodge;—look to the Molimgres or salt-boilers, a numerous population, who suffer the most hideous slavery under the Bengal government; they are forced to work at this trade, and a cordon of troops surround them to prevent their escape: but the government derives a large income from this monstrous tyranny. Can any government be worse, and have subjects? What worse can befall subjects than to live thus miserably, and thus prematurely perish?

What is the remedy? No one has taken a hint from Mr. Malthus's project for relieving the miserable Irish —to feed them on the dearest grain. No, the Indians must be taught the divine precepts of Christianity; they believe in Juggernaut, and some of them are as superstitious as the Christian convulsionaries, and fall down to be crushed by the idol's chariot[2]. The present Christian bishop of London only requires a *prostration of the intellect*. Some Hindoo wives also burn themselves with the remains of their husbands; yet this is confessedly no part of the religion of Brahma.

[1] A famine probably attributable to the government. In the Quarterly Review, No. 23, p. 194, &c. it is said, The Malabars are often subjected to hunger by dearths, which the government rather than the seasons occasion.

[2] This idol affords a revenue to the Company.

It is easily frustrated. Bernier says[1] he stopped a widow, who was determined to burn herself, by telling her she would thus leave her children without father or mother. Some parents of certain sects also exposed their female infants; yet, as I have said, Col. Walker's simple appeal to the humanity of the parents ended the practice. It appears, then, that the Hindoos are not unreasonable; yet they are to be reformed by being converted to Christianity. And for that purpose, the government at home, ever attentive to the wants of the people, lately sent Dr. Middleton to India under the title of bishop of Calcutta;—no doubt he will be as effective as his brethren in England[2]. To the bishop and his suffragans, missionaries have been recommended, who have been as resolutely opposed by the East India Company. When permission was asked from Governor Duncan for a missionary to go up the country, he answered, To be sure: but let him begin with the presidency, and first let him make Padre Burroughs (resident chaplain) a Christian:—this to be sure was before the episcopal appointment. The fact simply is, that the Company's servants are afraid that the missionaries would be too zealous, and endanger all things; and Dr. Buchanan, the star in the East, when he says "It is the duty of a Christian na-

[1] Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 8. p. 177.

[2] As all this recalls the puritanical times, why do we not first christianize our own country? Sir Thomas Bernard supposes that two-thirds of the population of London know no more of Christianity than the Caffres. In the puritanical æra they began at home, "Every Friday ordered for debate how the gospel might be preached in some dark places of this kingdom." Whitelocke, p. 222. 275.

tion to propagate Christianity as long as a nation shall be found upon earth which is ignorant of it," does not give much security for their discretion[1]. This rage for converting the Heathen is new to us. In Willoughby's directions for his people, nothing transpires of that passion[2]: in the puritanical times also, I only remember an account of four men of Somersetshire, who had an immediate call from God to go and preach the gospel in Galilee[3]. Yet now we have 208 missionaries in active service, and more may be expected; as the Rev. Mr. Daltry, in his speech prior to dismissing four missionaries to India at the beginning of the year 1814, reminded them of the words of our Saviour, "The labourers are few, but the harvest is great." Whatever be the intention of the missionaries, whether this world or the next; whether they are to be classed with John Kelsey[4], who went in 1769 to Constantinople to convert the Grand Seignor, or not,—this is certain, that there are more vouchers for the virtues of the Hindoos[5] than for the morality of British Chri-

[1] Colonial Establishment, p. 431. Archdeacon Nares spoke of thousands of Brahmins being converted. Mr. Waring so curtailed this number that the Archdeacon recanted, and attributed his error to Dr. Buchanan's Memoir on the Expediency of a Church Establishment in India. It appears that in seven years they made 109 converts, called *rice* Christians. This has been called proof of their diligence and success; yet Joanna Southcote had 40,000 believers.

[2] See item 22. in the Ordinance for the Crew.

[3] Whitelocke, p. 454. [4] Annual Register 1769, p. 297.

[5] Niebuhr says, "All who have opportunities of observing the lives of the Hindoos admire their patience, probity, and benevolence." Travels, c. 155. Col. Monroe speaks of their hospitality and charity among themselves, their tenderness and attachment to the women, among the particulars in which they exceed the Bri-

stians in or out of India; that there are infinite causes of dissension; that the two orders of military have little concord; that the ryots are discontented; that the peons, by being deprived of their pikes and daggers, are equally dissatisfied, and more dangerous; and that the mutiny at Vellore was, according to Lord Teignmouth, in some measure occasioned by the apprehension that Christianity would be forced upon the natives: and what occasioned the insurrections at Mundy-droog, Palam-cottah, Benares, and Bangapore?

Such is church and state in Hindostan; and it is tish. In Dekkan, containing 300,000 people, the numbers convicted for ten years did not amount to nine annually;—in one year in our capital they amounted to 1663. Sir H. Montgomery. Abu Taleb was surprised that the houses in England were kept shut through fear of thieves. Barrow says, "I give full credit to all that Mr. Vaillant has said with regard to the fidelity and attachment he experienced from this race of men, of whom the natural character and disposition seem to approach nearer to those of the Hindoos than any other nation." Tytler, who is least kind of those not missionaries to the Hindoos, admits that they possess "patience, mildness, obedience, hospitality, sobriety, temperance." Observations on India, vol. 1. p. 258. "They are neither quarrelsome nor revengeful." Ibid. p. 304. "They are in general humane." Ibid. p. 304. "Affection to relatives I have repeatedly witnessed, and often has it induced me to love and respect the native." p. 310. He also speaks with the highest praise of the honesty of house-servants, p. 310, and in the first volume, "Servants in India will always be what their masters make them; and if a kind master, you will probably keep the same servants as long as you are in the country." vol. 1. p. 68. Let the Hindoos be what they may, I perfectly agree with Dr. Watson, bishop of Landaff, "I do not, indeed, expect much success in propagating Christianity by missionaries from any part of Christendom, but I expect much from the extension of science and commerce." Life, &c. p. 198.

dogmatically insisted, that it cannot be improved. Yet these political necessarians express surprise that the Hindoos believe in predestination—the sad resource of those who overcome desperation; but it is wonderful to me, that the Hindoos should be doomed to eternal misery. When I heard Sir J. Malcolm's declaration, that the sword gained India, and by the sword it must be preserved; association recalled the Gordian knot. When I read Mr. Grant's statement, that the government of India "moves in a trajectory of its own," I heard unmeaning monstrous phraseology. But when I read that Sir W. Jones predestinated and damned the Hindoos to everlasting subjection, I own I was surprised. He (alluding to the popular tract for which the bishop of St. Asaph was tried) says, "As to the doctrines in that tract, though I shall certainly not preach them to the Indians, *who must and will be governed by absolute power*[1]; yet I shall go through life with a persuasion that they are just and rational; that substantial freedom is both the daughter and parent of virtue, and that virtue is the only source of public virtue and private felicity." What does this announce? That the Indians are necessarily subjected to vice and misery. Whence the necessity of this thraldom? An opinion is too general, that the Asiatics are preordained slaves. I must resist this conclusion at some extent, but with the utmost brevity.

Agesilaus said[2], The Asiatics are bad freemen, but good slaves. This royal paradox is met directly by Xenophon[3], who attributes the vices of the people of

[1] His Life, by Lord Teignmouth, p. 288.

[2] Plutarch. Moral. p. 114. [3] Instit. Cyri, lib. 8. p. 239.

Asia to their governors, as subjects assume their character from their rulers:—thus the Asiatics had declined from their former rank. Hippocrates also[1], though he refers something to climate, considers that they are milder and less warlike in consequence of their laws; the greater part of Asia being oppressed by monarchy. He says, Men who are slaves do not fight for themselves; and if they labour, they do not enjoy the fruits of their industry. To prove that these are the ruling causes for the disposition of these Asiatics, he adds, that Greeks and foreigners in Asia, who are not despotically governed, but who enjoy their own laws, are industrious and brave.——Now for facts.

No people of ancient times are more repeatedly contemned for their baseness than the Lydians[2]; they were the lowest ministers to luxury:—yet they were brave in Homer's age. Herodotus[3] also speaks of them as a hardy valiant race. But adds the historian[4], when they were conquered they were deprived of their arms; then they became impotent and dastardly. And Æschylus calls them an effeminate rabble[5]. They declined in every art and sentiment: their music, which had been spirited, was harmonized for softness and pleasures[6].

With the Lydians the Phrygians[7] were frequently

[1] Περι αερων, &c.

[2] Quis unquam Græcus comœdiam scripsit, in qua servus primarum partium non Lydus esset? Cicero pro Flacco, t. 2. p. 364.

[3] lib. 1. c. 79. Justin says, Gens industriâ quondam potens.

[4] lib. 1. c. 156. [5] Αξροδιαιτων Λυδων οχλος. Persæ, ver. 127.

[6] Επιτηδειον προς θρηνον. Plutarch. Moral. p. 439.

[7] Ælian. Hist. Var. lib. 10. c. 14.

associated for their common baseness, as the Phrygians were contrasted with the Arcadians: "Slaves from Phrygia, from Arcadia auxiliaries[1]." Yet the Phrygians were probably a military people, as the Phrygian harmony was reserved for warlike representations. The Cappadocians also were reviled by the universal voice of antiquity, for what now would be their eulogy; they preferred the rule of a king to a democracy. Cicero assails them with outrageous contempt; "sine sensu, sine sapore, elinguem tardum vecordem Cappadocem[2]." Yet the Cappadocian cavalry had been distinguished for their discipline and bravery. Cicero condemns the whole of Asia Minor to disgrace and slavery: Jews and Syrians, he says, were *natis servituti*[3]. He might as well have said, they were by nature eunuchs, as we learn from him that many Syrians were emasculated[4]. And though the Jews were *despectissima pars servientium*, they were once a warlike and conquering people,—a quality I abhor in them, and which was their destruction: but whether praised or blamed, the Jews and every other nation of Asia have been conquerors equally as the Europeans. Europe, Asia, and Africa have alternately triumphed: nor is it so long, that we should forget the subjection of a large part of Europe to Asiatics, and the danger of their absolute dominion over the whole continent. I speak now, however, of its ancient circumstances. Asia conquered, and was conquered by, the Greeks: it was conquered by the Romans, and under their

[1] Ανδραποδ' εκ Φρυγιας, απο δ' Αρκαδιας επικουρους. Athenæus, lib. 1. p. 27.

[2] Opera, t. 2. p. 398. [3] t. 2. p. 508. [4] t. 4. p. 464.

chief governors it was miserably abused. Volesus[1], pro-consul to the god Augustus, struck off three hundred heads, and glorified himself as having performed a royal achievement. Under such mal-administration the people, of course, declined not less in virtue than in number.

Passing further into Asia, we shall find that the vigour of the people was impaired or destroyed by the wickedness and tyranny of their rulers. Xenophon[2] speaks of the warlike Chaldæans. Such were the Babylonians: they were subjected; and after an ineffectual effort to escape the yoke of Xerxes[3] they were disarmed, and then they abandoned themselves to trivial pastimes. Advancing still further towards Hindostan,—the cause of this brief digression in defence of a continent of people,—the Medes and Persians were distinguished for their indomitable bravery[4]. Prior to the battle of Marathon, they were the terror of the Greeks[5]. Herodotus also says[6], The Barbarians were not inferior to the Greeks in strength and courage: and Thucydides[7], that they were only surpassed by the Athenians in discipline. The Persians declined in their institutions: they had honoured truth and ab-

[1] Volesus, nuper sub divo Augusto proconsul Asiæ, cum trecentos una die securi percussisset, incedens inter cadavera vultu superbo, quasi magnificum quiddam conspiciendumque fecisset, Græce proclamavit: O rem regiam! &c. Seneca de Ira, lib. 2. c. 5.

[2] De Instit. Cyri, lib. 3. p. 71. [3] Plutarch. Moral.

[4] Medes and Persians are confounded by Herodotus, lib. 6. c. 112. So were Cappadocians and Syrians, lib. 1. c. 72. lib. 7. c. 63. So were Syrians and Assyrians, &c.

[5] Herodotus, lib. 6. c. 112. [6] lib. 9. c. 42.

[7] lib. 6. p. 459.

horred falsehood[1]; they were patient of labour[2]; devoted to exercise[3]; eating but once a day[4], and frugally this single meal[5]. They conquered the Medes: then their virtues were attainted; they became effeminate in their habits[6], incapable of fatigue[7], luxurious, plethoric[8]. The officers of the army were encumbered with trappings, the camp incommoded with baggage, the soldiers lost their hardihood, and the people became so base and parasitical as to express more anxiety for the safety of Xerxes than for the fleet and army[9];—and they were treated accordingly: for the Persian kings consigned to their many wives, different cities, which became tributary to the toilets of the women of the polygamists[10]. The monarchy debased the people, ruined their morals and institutions; the people became stupidly loyal, deplorable royalists. The Assyrians and Medes, said Philostratus[11], adore

[1] Herodotus, lib. 6. c. 138. [2] Xenophon, p. 197.

[3] I have thought that the *houses of strength*, mentioned by Franklin the traveller, where men contend with clubs, wrestle, dance violently to music, may be remnants of the ancient education or discipline of the Persians. Franklin in Pinkerton, vol. 9. p. 243.

[4] Xenophon says so expressly. De Instit. Cyri, lib. 8. p. 240; and indirectly to have been the royal custom; as Megacreon of Abdera advised his countrymen to rejoice that Xerxes did not eat two meals in the same day. Herodotus, lib. 7. c. 120.

[5] Xenophon, p. 122. [6] Ibid. p. 241. [7] Ibid. p. 197.

[8] Ibid. p. 655. [9] Herodotus, lib. 9. c. 99.

[10] Solere aiunt barbaros reges Persarum ac Syrorum plures uxores habere, his autem uxoribus civitates attribuere, hoc modo: hæc civitas mulieri in redimiculum præbeat, hæc in collum, hæc in crines, ita populos habent universos non solum conscios libidinis suæ verum etiam ministros. tom. 2. p. 132, in Verrem.

[11] Philostratus, Apoll. Vita, lib. 1. c. 35.

tyrannies. The government of Persia is still hideous; *espionage* is unrivalled in that sad country. Franklin says[1], "Freedom of conversation is unknown in Persia; as that 'walls have ears' is proverbially in the mouth of every one."

We have now reached India, which anciently was not enslaved. Socrates said[2], the Indians enjoyed consummate liberty: and Pliny[3] speaks of Indian nations which were not subjected to kings, but were freemen. Let us, however, abandon ancient records, and see if we cannot defend the right or pretensions of the Hindoos to freedom by existing circumstances.

This will be considered Utopian, romantic, reforming. Orme states[4], that "the richness of the soil of part of Bengal, concurring with the unelastic atmosphere, has debased the essential qualities of the human race; and that the people are without industry, and without energy, and of a stupidity which neither wishes

[1] Pinkerton, &c. vol. 9. p. 258.

[2] Ælian. Hist. Var. lib. 10. c. 14. [3] lib. 6. c. 20.

[4] vol. 2. p. 3 et seq. History, &c. Much in the same tone of philosophy Mr. Tytler says, "The mild and regular climate of their country, and the fertility of their soil, easily supplying their wants and making them averse to labour, the regularity and simplicity of their diet may account for the apparent laziness of the Brahmins and lower classes, which is as remarkable as the industry and activity of the middle orders." Then the middle orders live under a wholly different climate from the other orders. The causes of the laziness of the Brahmins are truly the causes of all prerogative laziness; and Mr. Tytler himself refers the true cause of the apathy of the lower orders to the zemindary system, concluding, "successive subdivisions to an unlimited extent thus enhance the rent of the land, and it at length falls on the actual cultivator with a weight which for ever crushes all hopes of gain." vol. 1. p. 317.

nor seems to be capable of extending its operation into any variety of mechanic dexterity." This is the materialism which never alarms the righteous. The doctrine of submission can never be wrong in causes or consequences. Here the dullness of the people of Bengal is referred to a rich soil and an unelastic atmosphere. Had this historian ever heard of Newton's conjectures respecting a vibrating æther? Yet this apologist for the British in India says, in the succeeding page, concerning these very people aërially predisposed to indolence, "that a dread of extortion or violence from the officers of the district makes it prudent in him to appear and *to be poor*."

Another charge against the Hindoos is, that they are deficient in truth. Lying is as much the effect of tyranny, as poverty and stripes. The Greeks were so, but not formerly, says Cicero[1]; and he refers their deceit and acquiescence to their daily oppression. The Romans were sincere; but they became most false when overrun by the Barbarians[2]. Are not Jews throughout the world the victims of persecution and intolerance? Who but a fanatic imagines they are what they are by magic? Observe that Swinburne's account of the Mahometans in Grenada[3], as being extremely humble and smooth-tongued, is a counterpart of a description of the Jews; while in Greece the Christian personates

[1] Sin vero fallaces sunt permulti et leves, et diuturna servitute ad nimiam assentationem eruditi. Epistola ad Atticum, tom. 3. p. 402.

[2] Hoc solo id est quidvis luxuriæ, quidvis mendacii, imo quidvid vitiorum est comprehendens, &c. Luitprand. Muratori Script. Ital. tom. 2. p. 1.

[3] Travels in Spain, p. 170.

the Jew. "But," says Hobhouse[1], "I saw nothing in his face (though he was a Christian) of the cringeing downcast timid look of the Greek peasant." I may add, that the Mussulman in Grenada is another being when placed in other circumstances. Thornton says[2], "Honesty is the characteristic of the Turkish merchant, and distinguishes him from the Jew, the Greek, and the Armenian; against whose artifices no precaution can suffice." The falsehood of the Hindoos Dr. Heyne properly attributes to their political servitude. Were they better governed, they would improve in sincerity; were they less tormented by exactions, they would be more industrious:—but Mr. Orme says they find it *prudent to be poor*. Indeed! The Hindoos seem to excel in industry. Captain Pottinger says of them, "whose indefatigable industry is conspicuous wherever they are to be met with."

I see nothing among the Hindoos which should consign them irremediably to British despotism. A considerable portion of the Hindoos are weakly;—considering their repeated conquests and the grinding oppressions of their conquerors, it is marvellous that they exist. Riley's narrative shows how a strong robust man may be reduced; and what race could support its character after centuries of penury[3]! Yet still many tribes and nations remain in Hindostan to claim their rank in manhood: "The palanquin-bearers

[1] Travels, p. 99. [2] Turkey, vol. 2. p. 197.

[3] Mr. Malthus says, "In most countries, among the lower classes, there appears to be something like a standard of wretchedness." And this he actually attributes to any thing but the oppression from above.

are called rhois, and are remarkable for strength and swiftness[1]. Mrs. Graham[2] speaks of tribes of athletæ who use thirty-two kinds of weapons. Of the athletæ at Mysore Wilks says, "The whole world does not produce more perfect forms." Orme[3], who says he wrote his History principally to give a just idea of the superiority of European arms when opposed to those of Hindostan, speaks thus, "Each horseman was attended with his groom on foot[4]. This servant in India is by habit capable of keeping pace for several hours with the horse, although going at a great rate." He says of the Colleries[5], that "they are tall, well-made, and well-featured. Their arms are lances and pikes, and bows and arrows, rockets and match-locks; but whether with or without other weapons, every man wears a sword and shield. In battle the different arms move in distinct bodies; the lances are eighteen feet long."

Sir John Malcolm, in his Evidence, &c., thus testifies for the Hindoos of Benares and those of the interior: "They are not more distinguished by their lofty statures and robust frame of body, than they are for some of the finest qualities of the mind; they are brave, generous, and humane, and as remarkable for truth as courage." He lays a stress on those inhabiting the interior: and I perceive in Pinkerton's Collection[6], that while those along the coast and in cities are comparatively degraded, because the intercourse with their conquerors is there frequent and direct, those inland being less tormented by misrule are

[1] Graham's India, p. 128. [2] Ibid. p. 17. [3] vol. 1. p. 219.
[4] vol. 2. p. 166. [5] Ibid. p. 568. [6] vol. 11. p. 264 et seq.

eminently superior. The distinction is marked in the Alforese, who are removed from the coast, and who are brave and vigorous, while those who approach the sea are feeble and dastardly. The people of Hindostan are not very wretches: they are, when in tolerable circumstances, strong and vigorous; they do not want bravery. I have quoted unexceptionable authorities for the fact. According to Colonel Wilks, in single combat native officers are more than equal to Europeans. Lieutenant Pottinger says, The Scindeans are remarkable for personal bravery; so are the Sikhs; so are the Peons, haughty and warlike. Wathen relates, that an Englishman having hastily struck a Peon for improperly loosing a greyhound, the Peon, who was a Rajahpoot, immediately said, I am your servant and have long eaten your rice: he then plunged the dagger into his bosom. Bernier says[1] the Rajahpoots can endure much hardship, and only want order and discipline to be excellent soldiers. I trust I have done justice to the abused Hindoos; who have been represented, with all the Asiatics, as base born, mean in person, feeble in mind, poltroons, creatures made by God to be abused by the lordly Europeans, *who must and will be governed*, says Sir W. Jones, *by absolute power*; who are irretrievably indolent, says Orme, in consequence of *an unelastic atmosphere and the richness of the soil.*

> " Need we the influence of the northern star
> To string our nerves and steel our hearts to war?
> And where the force of nature laughs around
> Must sickening virtue fly the tainted ground?
> Unmanly thought!"

[1] Pinkerton's Travels, &c. vol. 8. p. 136.

Miserable philosophers! hateful governors! Sir W. Jones is not satisfied with *must and will*, and the dire necessity of absolute misrule: he makes Heaven a partner in this fated despotism. He says[1], "In these Indian territories, which *Providence* has thrown into the arms of Britain for their protection and welfare, the religion, manners, and laws of the natives prevent even the idea of political freedom." Then Providence has made us absolute masters of India; which mastery, he informs us,—and I have quoted his words,—ensures vice and misery! This gross contradiction, this execrable declaration, militates also against his general sentiments respecting mankind; as "it was a favourite opinion of Sir W. Jones[2], that all men are born with an equal capacity for improvement." To such extent will a little power and profit besot and stupify man's reasoning, apprehension, and principles. I declare I see nothing peculiar in the Hindoos:—oppression is the key to all their apparent obliquities. By craft and authority, a tribe, probably of foreigners[3], obtained dominion over the minds of this people, and their descendants still assume unqualified superiority. Formerly they reputed themselves gods[4], now they are

[1] Life, by Lord Teignmouth, p. 481. Sir John Malcolm, though a soldier, is not so horrible in his statements of the absolute necessity. He only regards their security to England. Yet sixty millions of people are little in the account of either. Political History of India, p. 459.

[2] Life, &c. p. 489.

[3] Broughton says, "The Brahmins are fair, have prominent features and comely persons; the rest are dark, with broad full faces, small features," &c.

[4] Philostratus, Apollonii Vita, lib. 3. c. 18.

lower. "The cast of the Brahmins is the highest; even above that of the kings. They say they were formerly the kings of the whole country, and presume to this day the privilege of commuting capital punishment, when merited, by the loss of their eyes[1]." This is not peculiar; it is theocratic, and agrees with the pretensions of Druids, Levites, Jesuits, ecclesiastics, &c. When they were gods they could do no wrong, now they enjoy the *benefit of clergy*. I see nothing in their religion that is not common to a hundred sects. They recount the battles of their gods; and they appeal for its truth to the spots on the sun and moon as marks of the contest. They had gods also of a higher form, generated of purest æther[2]. They have their ceremonies, their creeds, their misgivings, their consolations, their fancies, their particular providences. The Hindoos, says Scott[3], regard the failure of rain a sign of Divine displeasure. It is usual in times of drought for the emperor, attended by many religious persons, to go out to pray for rain. Scott adds, they generally choose a time when the clouds are heavy and promise an accomplishment of their petition. They have their paradise and their hells, in which they exhibit an elaborate imagination. They have their penances and processions. Maurice says[4], drawing an idol in a carriage obtains a remission of sins. With a theme of super-human virtue they are often

[1] Orme's Dissertation, p. 4.

[2] Αιθηρ ον ηγεισθαι χρη γενεσιν θεων ειναι. Philostratus, &c. lib. 3. c. 34.

[3] Ferishta's History of Dekkan, vol. 1. p. 102, note.

[4] Maurice's Hindostan, vol. 1. p. 104.

absurd and contradictory. The Morattoes[1] would not kill an insect that molested them, yet they delight in war; and as an atonement for the blood of their species they sacrifice a buffalo, as others have sacrificed human beings.

These things do not seem to me to be extraordinary; and certainly I cannot perceive how their *religion, manners, and laws, must prevent even the idea of political freedom,* as Sir W. Jones dogmatizes. They are not more attached to their religion than other people: if they are tenacious of their customs —who are not? A Jew will not eat pork, and a Russian in Peter's time would rather lose his head than his beard. The Hindoos have already relinquished injurious habits: burning of widows has declined; Hindoo infanticide has ceased; the Hindoos leave their country; Sepoy regiments passed by sea to Egypt in 1801;—and thus they overcame their prejudices with respect to eating and drinking[2]. Did not the Brahmins submit their laws to be digested by an European[3]? The immovability, then, of the Indian character is fictitious. On this particular the change in the conduct and opinions of the Sikhs is conclusive. Goru Govind wished to extinguish the arrangement of casts, and to effect the equality of all the Sikhs[4],

[1] Orme's History, b. 1. p. 41.

[2] Macgregor's Medical Sketches.

[3] Lord Teignmouth says, "It may be remarked as an occurrence of no ordinary nature, that the professors of the Brahminical faith should so far renounce their reserve and distrust, as to submit to the direction of a native of Europe the compiling a digest of their laws." Life of Sir W. Jones, p. 391.

[4] See Asiatic Researches, vol. 11. They have so frequently du-

in order that each might be obliged to depend on his individual character and exertions. In consequence, from being the victims of inveterate prejudices, and stupid through fear and abuse, this people soon became free and warlike. I see nothing, morally, which prevents the Hindoos from liberty. Even now the associated chiefs of the Sikhs resemble the baronial state of Europe when the king was general. In other parts of India,—in that through which Buchanan travelled,—a council of elders seems to supervise every village or district. It is remarkable, that in almost every village there are schools; and that from these sources some facilities of teaching the elements of learning in Great Britain have been derived. Add to this, their disposition to peace, their industry, temperance, their aptness to imitate [1], and their adroitness in manufactures—executing the most delicate work with the coarsest materials. As I must believe that they would rather use better than worse instruments in manufactures, and that by them they would improve their fabrics; so must I believe they would rather be well-governed than ill-governed: and I am persuaded that their profits, and the profits of their

ring the last war crossed the sea, that this capital prejudice is effectually extinct. Tytler also speaks of a relaxation respecting casts—that an intermixture of trades and professions has commenced, and that education is now no longer confined to the higher casts. Observations on India, vol. 1. p. 250.

[1] This is of ancient remark: Ostendens præterea Indos valde studiosos esse circa artes. Dicit quod cum spongiam apud Macedones vidissent, mox eam sunt imitati, &c. Strabo, lib. 15. vol. 2. p. 464.

governors, would be essentially advanced by every amelioration of their circumstances.

This must not be granted, because it might endanger the dominion of England in India. This is heartless, selfish, rascal policy. What have been India's transgressions to Great Britain? India has not preached the rights of man, nor made visionary war on the British constitution. What has England gained by India, that England should be interested in upholding her wickedness towards India? It never afforded slaves, the grand object of England's commercial policy, when her politicians triumphantly obtained the assiento contract[1]. It has afforded no tribute;—while the military force, the marine, the Cape of Good Hope, and the other stages by sea and land to the East, consume much more than all the sweepings and savings of the few fortunate adventurers who escape death and bankruptcy. Suppose that Madras was El Dorado, and Bombay, the golden city of Cathay; that the Ganges were Pactolus; that the wars in the East, instead of debt and waste, produced more prisoners than S. Gracchus'[2] conquest of Sardis;—that the wealth transmitted to Great Britain by Hastings and Wellesley and Moira, equalled the treasures which Pompey sent to Rome on the conquest of Asia; and those which P. Æmi-

[1] By this treaty of 1750, all disputes between England and Spain were settled. Beawes's Lex Mercatoria, p. 511. Mably, the philosopher, laments that his countrymen did not participate in the slave trade. Droit Publique, t. 2. p. 394.

[2] S. Gracchus tantum captivorum adduxit ut longa venditione res in proverbium venerat, Sardi Venales. A Victor, p. 79.

lius transmitted on the conquest of Macedonia, which it is said relieved the Romans from taxation for 125 years; and those which Cæsar [1] carried to Rome on the conquest of Ægypt, which were so great that they effectually reduced the interest of money, and raised the price of land;—What then? should England support a tyranny, a grinding despotism, a suspicious miserable misrule, for money's-worth? We should, forsooth, risk our dominion by a liberal policy; "Eh bien! périssent les colonies plutôt que les principes!" said Barnave, the eloquent and strenuous friend of liberty. But we gain nothing. Gain! we lose much. This Eastern empire has grievously perverted the independence of the people of Britain;—it is a source of immense patronage to the crown;—it affords a retreat to those who can conscientiously enjoy a bribe payable abroad: And this is its value.

What can be more miserable and suspicious than the British government in India? No one must enter this Eastern world, though largely inhabited by Moors, Arabs, Persians, Portuguese, Guebres, Tartars,—except he has obtained the dread authority of the rulers in Leadenhall-street; none enters it except a servant of the Company. Who then has cognisance of the state of India, but a companion? So that the little that transpires is by accident, and from one under the shrewd suspicion of being more favourable to the Company than to truth. This circumstance is, however, sufficiently descriptive of the wretchedness

[1] Suetonius, lib. 2. c. 57. Cæsar had a supplication to the God of fifty days length. Dion Cassius, lib 43. c. 42. Te Deums are of great antiquity.

of the government. They seem to fear that the English should become Indian, or the Indian approach the British. No effort is made to facilitate the connexion of the two people. Bonaparte employed a company of players when he invaded Egypt, "as an amusement to the army, and as a means of changing the manners of the country." Nothing of this kind is permitted in the presidencies.

If Bonaparte can afford us no lesson but wickedness—learn of ancient Rome. Rome laboured to introduce the Latin language into all her dependencies: for this purpose she established, in each of the seventeen provinces of Gaul, schools professedly to introduce the Latin dialect, and the Romance language was eventually the consequence of this policy; what was Romance in France was provincial [Provençale] at Rome. Rome pursued the same conduct in Britain. The use of the imperial language as a means of government is forcibly inculcated by Machiavel [1], and the affiliation it ensures between independent states is explained with equal justness by Talleyrand [2]. Instead of attracting by the mind, the ear, and the tongue, the people of Hindostan, Francis Wrangham recommends founding a Christian cast. Sir William Jones [3] recommends *translations into Sanscrit and Persian of such chapters of the Prophets, and particularly Isaiah, as are indisputably evangelical, and dispersed among the well-educated.* Dr. Buchanan recommends "that the parables of the Gospels alone be distributed among a barbarous peo-

[1] Il Principe, p. 4. [2] Mémoire, &c. p. 11.

[3] Life, p. 453.

ple," &c. Some would have the whole Bible propounded, as means of governing India; some a few prayers. Long since Cosmo de Medici [1] said, States are not to be preserved by Pater-nosters.

Nothing effectual is done to conciliate the natives, or any part of them. Indian-built ships, by a quibble on the 26th of Geo. III. c. 69, are prevented from the benefit of registry, even when England wants ships, and so wants timber, that though she cannot feed her people, a portion of her domain is reserved for the growth of oak. England has made conquests, but she has not taken one effectual step to secure them. The Romans knew,—it was their maxim,—"Plus est provinciam retinere quam facere [2]." And Florus [3] gives the reason—" viribus parantur, jure retinentur." The Romans, when they conquered they colonized. A colony represents the state, is the patron of the province, and so far it tends to justice: it promotes in various ways the fellowship or union of the subject and the sovereign. In India, this is not to be tolerated in the remotest manner. The India Company is more suspicious than their Catholic and Faithful Majesties in South America; than the successors of Mahomet in Europe [4], or in the East [5]. The admission into India

[1] Che gli stati non si tenevano con Pater Nostri in mano. Machiavel Storia, lib. 7. p. 248.

[2] Florus, lib. 2. c. 17. [3] lib. 4. c. 12.

[4] " It is not permitted to Mussulmans to make a fixed residence in either principality. Those whom commercial or state affairs occasionally bring into the country, are lodged in the khans or hotels expressly built for their accommodation in Yassy or Bucharest." Thornton, &c. vol. 2. p. 355.

[5] Indeed the Mogul empire in the East was as becoming as the

of a Briton, not serving the Company, is more wonderful than man's descent to Avernus in Pagan story. Nothing approaching colonization is tolerable even in discourse[1], though by colonization Rome's authority in Italy was unassailable by the genius and fortune of Hannibal. Colonization began with the Roman power[2]; and by this, far more than by the arms of Rome, the dominion of Rome was confirmed. But observe, the Roman colonies carried abroad the image of the Roman government[3]. They were to Rome, what the American Provinces were to Britain[4]. It is most melancholy that sixty millions of people are doomed to endure slavery, as long as it can be imposed, to a mere trading company. It is vexatious that the London companies should in con-

English is base, in a religious view, in Great Britain and Ireland. "The religion of Bengal by law established is Mahometan; yet for one Mahometan there are above an hundred Pagans; and the public offices and posts of trust are filled promiscuously with men of both persuasions." Hamilton's Account of the East Indies. Pinkerton, &c. vol. 8. p. 414.

[1] There is an exception:—The Tannah establishment in Bengal, a tract of country a hundred miles long, was a few years ago a mere jungle for tigers and robbers. It was given to old soldiers and their families, who have converted it into fine fields and villages. Malcolm, Polit. Hist. of India, p. 526. He is favourable to colonizing India, p. 475.

[2] Dion Halicarnassus, lib. 2. c. 16. It continued in full force to the time of Julius Cæsar. He sent 80,000 citizens to the transmarine colonies. Suetonius, lib. 1. p. 43.

[3] Decuriones quidem dictos aiunt ex eo, quod initio coloniæ deducerentur decima pars eorum, qui ducerentur, consilii publici gratia conscribi solita est.

[4] The establishment of these provinces was highly honourable—their taxation was vicious and absurd.

sequence of misrule appropriate lands in the north of Ireland; but that a company in London, a tea monopoly, from having a warehouse-guard [1] to secure goods from common theft, should conquer the continent that unsuspiciously received them, and there rule despotically sixty millions of men;—nay, that this populous world cannot, *in the nature of things*, be relieved, is to combine all monstrous thoughts in the same image.

Yet true to the adage—That perdition and infatuation are twin-born of vice—the governors of India will not admit the customary mode of strengthening their empire. No; they will not even use the means which present themselves, which obtrude on their attention for their security. It is calculated that the half-cast children, born of native women and European fathers, amount to 30,000:—one would imagine that these should be particularly considered by the government. Quite the reverse—abandoned by their sordid fathers, they are rejected by the government. They cause regret, not as being memorials of British incontinence and British baseness: the regret is, "They are forming," says Lord Valentia [2], "the first step to colonization, by creating a link of union between the English and the natives." So speaks the single and sole favourite of the company and government of India. What is to be done with these infinitely abused beings? I have read some right merry dogmas in a presumptuous journal, of violating nature—and crossing breeds—and obliquity of

[1] Malcolm's Polit. Hist. p. 480.

[2] Travels, vol. 1. p. 241.

disposition in consequence (though the same authors fervently believe that Adam and Eve were the parents of mankind). D'Azara, on the contrary, says that an Indian and European exhibit better specimens of man, than Creoles produced from Spanish parents. I doubt both the reputed excellence and inferiority in either case; but it is certain, if Humboldt be an authority, that the children of Indian women by Spaniards under the Spanish tyranny, possessed, with few exceptions, all the privileges of children born of Spanish mothers by Spanish fathers. Yet the half-cast children in India are utterly excluded from the military and civil service of the Company.

This treatment of the half-cast children resembles the conduct of those crusaders who possessed Palestine, to their spurious offspring. These Christian warriors associated with the females of the country: their children were called poulains, and despised:—yet it has been remarked, that by a different conduct these would have recruited the power of their fathers and sustained their empire. This government, which compared to the Indian was founded on adamant, lasted only 150 years, which is shorter than the dominion of the Assassins [1]. Yet the Indian empire of Britain is comparatively of yesterday, and it has suffered many desperate shocks; and such is its wretchedness, that the government systematically adds to its enemies this perpetually increasing half-cast population. Have they never heard of the Parthenoi in Sparta?—probably not. But they may have heard of the policy of the Egyptian king, who tampered with

[1] It subsisted 170 years.

nurse-tenders, to procure the abortion of the increasing Hebrew slaves in his dominions. As this failed, it may be useful to suggest a more efficacious remedy: —it relates to the Carthaginians, who like the British were addicted to foreign commerce, and from factories established dominations. Aristotle says[1], that the Carthaginians established themselves in a fertile island beyond the columns of Hercules. The settlers contracted marriages with the natives. On this the Carthaginian government ordered that no one should henceforward enter the island, on pain of death; and they extirpated the settlers and their children, lest they should by their marriages injure Carthaginian supremacy, by obtaining themselves the sovereignty of the island. This was more decisive and kinder policy than the conduct of the British in India to the children of their servants. They are considered enemies, and this treatment must create or increase their enmity. Be kind and princely, and despatch them. It suits the Prince's government, according to Machiavel's display of cabinet councils, and it accords with the philosophy of Hobbes, "that while men are afraid of one another, nobody can have better security than by prevention: so that every one should endeavour to oppress all others, either by violence or fraud, while there are any remaining to be afraid of[2]."

Such then is the state of our Indian empire, that while we read of successes round the circle of our frontiers, we cannot be assured that then one vestige of our Eastern government remains, or that one of

[1] Opera omnia, t. 1. p. 1157.

[2] Leviathan, c. 13. De Cive, c. 5.

our institutions survives our banishment, to excite a kind recollection or transient regret in the native of India; or one consolation to the British people, for all the evils they have done and suffered. We have planted no monument of art or industry in India; we have communicated no lights of science, nor established any government that may hereafter assist their wants or their wishes or their rights; our literature is unknown, our language is untaught. It was Plato's[1] dread that Sicily might pass to the Phœnician dynasty, and that thus the colonies of Greece in that island might lose the Grecian tongue[2]. With language—arts, science, deeds, philosophy, institutions are communicated, confirmed, consecrated; nor is there one existing language, so affluent and so vigorous as the English—none which contains so many subjects of the truest fancy, the loftiest imagination, the intensest interest, with all that is useful

[1] Epist. 8. p. 1296. Opera.

[2] A writer in the Edinburgh Review, No. 28, p. 329, says, "It is not easy to assign the precise notion which the early Greeks annexed to the term Barbarian, unless we consider it as synonymous with stranger or foreigner." Barbarian regarded the language — Βαρβαρος ουκ επι εθνους, αλλ' επι φωνης ελαμβανετο. Stephanus de Urbibus, p. 153. Dion of Halicarnassus says, The Tarentines, who were Greeks, treated the Roman ambassador with contempt, because he spoke Greek incorrectly; and on that account Βαρβαρον εκαλουν. Excerpt. 4. p. 710. So Aristophanes, Equites, ver. 17. Βαρβαριζει ως δουλος. Strabo says, Omnes itaque qui crasse loquuntur Barbari dicuntur: quales sunt nationes omnes præter Græcos. Lib. 14. t. 2. p. 373. So Ovid,

In paucis extant Græcæ vestigia linguæ;
Hæc quoque jam Getico barbara facta sono.
Trist. lib. 5.

to men and nations. Suppose that a liberal and enlightened policy tended eventually to liberate India from England, I can perceive no reason why such policy should not be adopted. Under such circumstances, so long as it remained subject, it would be more profitable, as a free servant is more serviceable than a slave. I speak not of the profit of one man or a few, whose advantage is often in direct opposition to that of the nation. I speak for the nation, for its justice, its honour, and glory :—true political glory rules rather by authority than by power, and makes the interest of all minister to universal obedience. The best present government would be, that which soonest enabled the inhabitants of India to enjoy liberty and property, independent of the control, assistance, or supervision of Great Britain; and this would be a glorious retribution to the Indians for British conquest, rapacity, and outrage.

I am no advocate for colonizing. Colonies are attended with a train of evils: they divert attention from domestic affairs; increase patronage, and corrupt the ministers of power, as they are removed from responsibility and control. If colonies be intended for commerce, as those anciently by the Phœnicians [1], the merchant, from bartering with the natives, soon endeavours to command them and their productions.

In every way I object to colonies as they have been planted and appointed. The supposition of their service to the parent state is among the greatest of vulgar errors. Mr. G. Grant lately said that Jamaica exports 98,000 hogsheads of sugar, which

[1] Thucydides, lib. 6. p. 412.

pays 2,000,000*l*., and that England in return exported 3,000,000*l*. of manufactures. Suppose so; the duty is no gift of the colonial trade: and the three millions of manufactures might be exported, or more, if the West Indian colonies were emancipated. Suppose not; the three millions of manufactures are not a gain of three millions; they afford a profit of eight or ten per cent., perhaps, that is 3 or 400,000*l*. This is the whole amount of the benefit—But what is this sum, compared to the expenditure for the military protection of the island? How many British soldiers perished in this island in the last war! 17,000 troops died by sickness in the Windward Islands, *exclusive* of the mortality in St. Domingo and Jamaica, from 1786 to 1802: and what sum is to be charged for their protecting navy? Would the profits of a few hundred thousand pounds on merchandise indemnify the state for this various and enormous expenditure? Why John Glasfurd (one individual) drew six millions of bills on the treasury, from 1798 to 1805, during seven of the twenty-five years war, and his accounts are yet inaudited.

But many derive large incomes from the West Indies. Sir W. Young's[1] testimony is decisive on this subject. He says, "A speculative purchaser may receive, for some very few years, 12 per cent.; but the epidemic diseases among the negroes, the effect of war, insurrections, &c. will at once and for ever reduce the computation of large interest for his purchase money." He also says, "that the hereditary landholder, who by himself or family has shared the losses

[1] Colonial Common Place Book, p. 26.

incident to the nature of his property in every course of years, does not, I will venture to assert, receive four per cent. on the capital laid out in original settlement, adding sums of money since expended in occasionally restoring his estates." Can property be invested less productively? All that Great Britain enjoys from her colonial commerce are the profits derived from the manufactures exported. Yet rate these as highly as possible[1], we must, beside the ruinous cost in protecting the colonies, deduct from the profits mentioned the enhancement of the sugar to the consumers. I am persuaded that the surcharge on the article to the British people exceeds the profits on their exported industry; for the sugar of the West Indies is brought into market through a labyrinth of difficulties, and loaded—loaded perversely and monstrously—by the state-monopoly, by the shipping interest, by the refiners[2], by a long succession of oppressors down to the slave-owners and the masters of the gangs. This last gradation or degradation of human misery would, singly, inordinately enhance the

[1] Take one instance. On the 6th of Feb. 1804, the West India merchants petitioned the king and parliament, stating, "That the planters in the sugar colonies could neither subsist their negroes, nor provide package for their produce, without supplies from America of provisions and lumber, and that a circuitous passage of British ships, *via* America, would not only incur a surcharge of freight and commission most heavy, but by accidents would prevent their use when they arrived; and that the medium of ordinary exchange in the sugar-colonies, for lumber and provisions, was rum, which America would take, and which the merchants of Great Britain would not take." Yet for nine years, till 1793, government resisted this application, in order to gratify the shipping interest.

[2] This part of the evil was lamented in Davenant's time.

article. Long since, Mons. de Poivre said, respecting the extraordinary cheapness of sugar in Cochin China by free hands, "Compare the price of the Cochin China production, with the same commodity which is cultivated and prepared by the wretched slaves of our European colonies."

Colonies, in whatever way they are presented to the unprejudiced, are expensive, and their expenditure constantly exceeds the ratio of their return. In 1814, the revenue of the Cape of Good Hope increased to 129,575*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.*, but the disbursements of the same year amounted to 244,138*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* They cause presumption, and thus they exasperate envy and hatred. Athens and Sparta alternately became victims of ambitious colonization. Athens, after its double triumph, colonized the land of the Hippobatæ with 4000 men[1]; they also transmitted the same number to the country of the Chalcidians[2]. Athens also, under Pericles[3], sent out many colonies, not for want of food and room, as Mr. Malthus would probably insist, but expressly to increase the interest of Athens. Yet these, while they gave present power, ensured eventual weakness; from being beloved, the Athenians were detested, and they declined till their existence was in peril. Distress taught them wisdom, and they resumed their moral dominion by renouncing all their colonies and conquests. The Spartans followed the same course, and they sunk like the Athenians; but wanting the excessive vitality of most popular institutions, they fell without the means of regeneration. Considering co-

[1] Herodotus, lib. 5. c. 78. [2] Ibid. lib. 5. c. 77.
[3] Plutarch, p. 361.

lonies, particularly in respect to the present subject, as a means of relieving an extreme populousness, should it occur, they are a desperate remedy if we judge from the results. Talleyrand[1] speaks of *des milliers de François* who perished in the expedition to the Mississippi, Cayenne, &c. 12,000 individuals, who were sent by the French government to Guiana, were also lost. How destructive was the Scotch expedition to Darien! Emigration to Newfoundland has failed; and now the inhabitants in that island are in the utmost misery[2], as are those on the continent along the Red River. America, notwithstanding its eventual success and portentous consequences, records an aggregate of failures. Colonization has failed in other quarters of the world. Wadstrom's project, in 1799, of establishing a republic on the coast of Africa, failed; so did Captain Beaver's attempt at Bulama. So at Sierra Leone; of seventeen hundred persons who arrived at that settlement in 1799, in 1800 twelve only survived. From ignorance of the time suited to such establishments, from unfitness of settlers for a new and unexpected life, from irrational hope and diverse causes, colonization, as a relief from a crowded population, is a vain effort, and at best a temporary expedient; the vacancy must soon be supplied, if the emigrants do not transport with themselves much more than their persons. My objection is directly the reverse of those who fear depopulation from emigration; for emigration, regarding merely the egress of people, leaves

[1] Mémoire.

[2] See debate on Mr. M. A. Taylor's motion last year on this subject.

the swift means of increase behind. Besides, I cannot perceive any necessity, from the population of nations, that they should recur to colonization. The sums of money that have been wasted on such projects, would have supported those at home who perished abroad; not that I recommend, for on the contrary I condemn, all such tampering with people and their industry, as has been latterly proposed for the English poor. Observe, that while much capital has been lost in the outfit of colonies, and in their protection, the same countries which furnished the colonists, have increased in numbers vastly beyond their complement, when those issues were thought indispensable to the ease of the people. I detest the notion of taking from one class to give to another, and all that cabinet curiosity in politics, where a minister, or a board, presumes to regulate what should be submitted to the dominion of circumstances; but I say, if we are to be meddlers and transplanters at a common cost, I would rather see capital perverted on a colony at home, than at Labrador, or at Caucasus, or Samoyda, or Upper Canada, where men with double labour scarcely raise half produce, and who are more wasted by the pains of memory than by hunger and fatigue. If colonies be sent abroad, let them go, not as servants, but equals[1]; let them be dismissed sincerely, and with a surety of their success. Plato says, let so many colonists (a hundred) be accompanied by as many of the oldest of the Cnossians; let these act as fathers, until all things be set-

[1] Tullus said, It is not just that the parent-state should command their colonies. Dion Halicarnassus, lib. 3.

tled, and then return to Cnossus[1]. This is paternal, and shows a perfect apprehension of equity and benevolence. Other particulars were equally understood by Plato; in the same page he says, there has been, and will be, much strife between parent-states and their colonies. It was a topic familiar even to the oracle, who answered Timesias, who consulted her on the propriety of planting a colony, "Your swarm of bees will soon become wasps[2]." This must ever be the case when colonies are treated with insult and oppression; for, as Thucydides says, men become colonists, not that they should be slaves, but equals[3]; nor is any thing good, or safe, or profitable, but equity and equality. The first sea-fight on record was between the Corinthians and their own colony of Corcyra[4], and the last between England and America.

CHAPTER VI.

Corn Laws.—Bounties.—Prohibition to import foreign corn, &c.

I HAVE considered population under various aspects, and my conclusions have often been the inverse of those of Malthus. While he esteems government, that is laws, institutions, and their administration, of inconsiderable influence compared to *misery deep-seated in*

[1] De Legib. lib. 6. p. 857.

[2] Σμηνα μελισσαων, ταχα τοι και σφηκε εσονται. Plutarch. Moral. p. 58.

[3] Ου γαρ επι τω δουλοι αλλ' επι τω ομοιοι ειναι εκπεμπον.

[4] Thucydides, lib. 1. c. 13. To her next colony, to Epidamnus, she was wiser: it was established επι τη ισῃ και ομοια.

human nature: I, regarding civilized man, esteem bad laws and iniquitous government as the paramount and pregnant source of the calamities of nations. Indeed Mr. Malthus argues the subject of population, as if he had received a license for lecturing since the session of 1817, when political questions were prohibited. Any and all things are chargeable with infirmity by him in his categories, but government, which is openly defended, or treated with mysterious respect. Nature prompts, man and woman are nothing loth; they breed unwittingly at the rate of 1, 2, 4, 8, and food grows as 1, 2, 3, 4. *Ergo,* men press against subsistence; and because miserable individuals appear in various countries, the accelerated increase of mankind beyond food is substantiated by facts. These propositions are to me more extravagant in themselves, and in their connexion, than the themes of Pindar's eulogy and his transitions.

All vices and follies of fathers and mothers,—idleness, company-keeping, gambling, epicurism, gluttony, drunkenness, silly projects, hazardous speculations, profusion, and prodigality of all kinds, which reduce families or keep them distressed, are all identified by Mr. Malthus with overbreeding. There is misery; but how does misery prove that overbreeding is the cardinal and catholic sin? Men breed heedlessly; but this vice or folly is but one of the many causes of man's misery. If the savage wants, there, says Mr. Malthus, you behold the effect of overbreeding, though there are few children and absolute improvidence:—if manufacturers be out of employment, this is overbreeding also. About twenty-five years ago, wearing shoe-

buckles and torturing the head ceased to be indispensable; thence many workers in metal and hair-dressers were discharged, and they were distressed. Count them, says Mr. Malthus, and here behold the crime and punishment of overbreeding. During the war, few watches were imported from the continent: of course this manufacture increased in Great Britain, but the peace introduced foreign watches; in consequence several thousand watch- and clock-makers in London were reduced to poverty. Here, says Mr. Malthus, you perceive my theory is demonstrated by those five thousand mendicant artists and their wanting families. During the war, our most prodigal government wasted, by loans, so largely the capital of the country, that important branches of industry wanted the funds necessary for their success, which, with other causes, paralysed industry and enterprise. Many of course, who had been fully paid and fully occupied, could only obtain half work or half wages, and some were absolutely discharged: Triumphant proofs, cries Mr. Malthus, of an heedlessly overbreeding people. Men will breed, and must starve. Nature predetermined this consequence, and I first revealed the mighty truth.

Yet truly during this war, beside the loans by which capital was disssipated and extinguished, immense taxes were charged on every article which could bear an impost, and on many which sunk under the pressure. The nation was taxed so enormously, that the revenue, which had rapidly risen from the first year of the war, and whose gross produce in 1798 was 26,820,629*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, amounted in 1815 to 81,334,292*l.* 9*s.* 0¼*d.* Much of this charge fell directly

on the labouring population, much indirectly. For mankind endeavour to shift the weight from themselves on others; and in the general effort to escape oppression, the weight falls on those on whom all falls, as surely as the entablature rests on the column, and this on its base. This enormously descending taxation, and the positive taxes on the people's necessaries without any adequate increase of wages, but, on the contrary, in some cases, with their positive reduction, also afflicted many with indigence, and plunged some into the abyss of poverty. On this Mr. Malthus cries, Triumphant principle of population! Oh, nature, and geometry, and all the satyrs, how the British breed! And thou arithmetic, and famine, and epidemics, and death, see how they starve!

Against the whole of this doctrine I demur—Whatever be the excess of people beyond employment, the excess is not attributable to the people, nor is their misery of their own making, unless we conclude that they wasted the capital of the state in foreign subsidies, in conquests east and west, &c.; unless we assume that they imposed taxes on their own soap, salt, leather, beer, tobacco, and bread; for every tax which affected agriculture tended to enhance the quartern loaf.

In 1815, the people were moderately employed, ill-paid, miserable. The legislature (the members of the House of Commons) turned their thoughts to the sufferings of the people; and this authentic organ of the public voice, to secure abundance for ever, passed that monument of sagacity and patriotism—the corn-law.

This subject implicates the foreign policy, the do-

mestic industry, and the subsistence of the people of Great Britain and Ireland. From the earliest period Britain exported corn to Rome[1]: grain also during the Saxon government was a constant article of commerce. The Normans, conquerors and tyrants, aggravated all that was evil, while they introduced many new calamities into the state. The estates of many Britons were seized on the first spoliation, or by subsequent confiscations, and granted to captains and followers of the conqueror. The intercourse of citizens was abridged; trades became crafts, professions gilds[2]. Commerce suffered a similar violation; and though a privilege to break the law was among the ways and means of a rapacious government, the export of grain was prohibited. It seems to have been with few exceptions the policy of ancient British statesmen to secure plenty at home, by withholding the export of victuals. Banks (the attorney-general) against Hampden[3], in the great cause respecting ship-money, said: "In all ages he (the king) hath commanded no victuals shall be transported. Claus. 24 Edw. III. m. 7 dors. 5 Dec. 4 Hen. VIII. 11 Hen. VII. 23." This, however, admits of some exceptions; for by one of the early chronicles[4] it appears that considerable quantities of corn were exported. yet this must be esteemed extraordinary, as the fines for licenses to export corn registered in the exchequer prove the rule and the

[1] Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. 18. c. 2. Strabo, lib. 4.

[2] Madox, Firma Burgi, c. 1. § 9. There were gilds among the Saxons, something like Friendly Societies.

[3] State Trials, vol. 1. p. 665. Irish Edit.

[4] Gul. Pictaven, p. 210.

infraction [1]. It seems that the export of grain in those early periods resembled the license trade to France during the last war.

In 1425 the exportation of grain without licenses was permitted by law, subject however to duties, and liable to be restrained by the king in council. The 4 Hen. VI. c. 5. was followed by the 15 Hen. VI. c. 2. This, says Barrington [2] (and he is wrong), "is the first permission to export corn in the statute book." He adds in a note: "the good policy of this statute, *with the addition of the bounty upon exportation*, hath made England the granary of the world." This florid eulogy on the omnipotence of a bounty is transcribed from William of Poictou, who thus panegyrized England centuries before the existence of a bounty.

In 1463 the members of the House of Commons complained that an excessive import so depreciated corn in England, that English farmers were exposed to ruin. These patriots, from whom the modern corn-law-givers are directly descended, enacted, that wheat should not be imported until its price exceeded 6*s.* 8*d.*; nor rye, nor barley, till the first exceeded 4*s.* and the latter 3*s.* a quarter.

This was followed by the 12th, 15th, and 22d of Charles the Second. The last (c. 13) exhibited a graduated scale of obstructed import. When wheat did not exceed *53s.* 4*d.* the quarter in the home market, it paid 16*s.* duty; and when it did not exceed 4*l.*, 8*s.* duty. This has been considered a rare

[1] Madox has extracted some of them.

[2] Ancient Statutes, p. 307.

effort of science; and an attempt was made by a reporting committee of the House of Commons in 1814 to improve this scale, by a longer and minuter scale of graduation. To the non-importing law of the 22d of Charles the Second, was added the 1st of William and Mary, which encouraged exportation by a bounty, when the quarter of wheat did not exceed 48*s*. This, according to country gentlemen and rural reasoners, and sage ministers, was honoured as the maximum of human legislation. Mr. Malthus admires it, and Mr. Western solicits its readoption: the latter would thus add debt to the mountains of taxation, that the English grower might undersell foreigners in their own market; though, he says, the English farmer, even were he to pay no rent, could not successfully meet the foreign grower in the British markets. If the corn laws passed in Charles the Second's reign, and the bounties granted by the 1st of William and Mary, be so excellent that they should be regarded as exemplary laws and standard statutes; we must admit that the authors of them were both wise and lucky: for when they passed them, few had any exact knowledge of any one particular fact respecting political œconomy: even Davenant, the most intelligent person of his time on such subjects, imagined that England in a plentiful year produced five times the stock of grain requisite for the consumption of its people.

When the corn law was agitated in 1815, the people were directed to the effects of the laws in Charles the Second's reign and William's. Why should the bounty-giving law of William and Mary have soli-

cited their attention, when a bounty on export made no part of the projected statute of 1815? Suppose, however, that the export of grain about the time of the Revolution followed the laws of Charles and William;—a consequence is not an effect. The yam was introduced into South America by a slave-ship from Africa;—the slave trade and the increased subsistence of the Americans are not cause and consequence. To speak more directly to the purpose: If circumstances in sequel indicate causation, we must infer that the prohibition, after the conquest of Britain by the Normans, to export corn, raised the price of that article from three shillings to eighteen pounds the quarter; and that the law of 1804, which permitted exportation, doubled the price of wheat; though the enhanced price immediately on passing the act prevented the exportation of a single quarter. A consequence taken as an effect would also discredit the corn law of 1815 still more than it deserves; for it was succeeded with a sudden and excessive enhancement, and with general misery.

Suppose, however, that the 12th, 15th, and 22d of Charles the Second, and the 1st of William and Mary, were followed by the export of grain;—on what grounds should we conclude that these laws produced or ministered to this event? Though the export of grain was prohibited in William the Conqueror's reign, and in the reigns of his successors, grain was occasionally exported, and the grower paid the crown for the liberty. William of Poictou says [1], "Then England might be called the storehouse of

[1] Henry's History, vol. 3. b. 3. c. 6.

Ceres, out of which the world was supplied with corn." This extravagance (to which I have already alluded) proves that some grain was exported, when export laboured under obstructions and penalties. The export of corn continued under similar impediments. Hume says [1], "A judicious author of that [Elizabeth's] age confirms the vulgar observation, that the kingdom was depopulating, from the increase of inclosures and decay of tillage; and he ascribes the reason, very justly, to the restraints put on the exportation of corn." If corn was exported under difficulties, and that tillage and export declined by increasing difficulties, why should not both agriculture and export of corn have resumed their activity by the removal of these difficulties? It is therefore hypothetical and gratuitous to refer to the 22d of Charles the Second, and the 1st of William and Mary, for the resumed exportation of grain.

There is also another most important point for consideration. Corn may be exported, either when tillage is enlarged, or when the home consumption is reduced. It may therefore be questioned by those who consider that a succession of facts evince cause and effects, if the wonder-working laws so often mentioned of Charles and William did not reduce the people rather than increase their agriculture. Temple speaks frequently of the indisposition to marry, and of the depopulation of England [2]. That England was depopulated by the mismanagement of Charles the First, by the civil war, by Cromwell's tyranny, there

[1] History, vol. 5. p. 484.

[2] Popular Discontents. Works, vol. 1. p. 267.

is reason to believe. Besides, it is ascertained that the houses in Britain had decreased; and this decrease from 1690 to 1766, according to the estimation of Dr. Price [1], amounted to a million and a half of inhabitants. When I restate this, I am aware of all that I have written respecting the insufficiency of houses under any rate to determine the amount of the people: but here the reduction of houses is not questioned; and this occurred in the same country, and in the same uninterrupted tract of time. This would of itself utterly discredit the wonder-working laws of non-importation, and of bounty. Let us recur to the facts. By the tables of import and export of corn, it appears that the export increased to 1750: then there was a stop. And from 1760 to 1770, the exported corn exceeded the imported only as 429,017 quarters do 265,730 quarters. This brings us beyond the term of declining houses and a reduced consumption, as stated by Dr. Price. In the next ten years England exported 284,715 quarters, while she imported 613,083 quarters. During this interval population certainly increased; and then England from an exporting became decidedly an importing nation:—that is, tillage having succeeded to grazing, which was more profitable in Davenant's time, manufactures succeeded to tillage. The people increased, and the ratio of manufacturers exceeded the ratio of agriculturists.

Independent of these facts, it seems utterly absurd that the 22d of Charles could have enabled England to export. This law prohibited import of grain till

[1] Expectation of Lives, &c. Supplement, p. 299.

it reached certain prices. This could only increase the home growth for the home consumption; it could not enable the nation to raise cheaper grain for the foreign market: if England exported grain, it raised it more cheaply than the foreign grower; and if the British grain rivalled the foreign grain in the foreign market, the prohibition to import foreign grain into the English market was nugatory. The benefit, therefore, of the 22d of Charles is fantastic. There remains the law of William and Mary, which granted a bounty of 5 shillings a quarter on export, when wheat was under 48 shillings the quarter. Remark, that this bounty was granted in 1690; but the value of money declined from 1690 to 1750: yet the export of grain regularly increased to 1750. In 1701 the export was 139,866 quarters; in 1749, the export was 932,593 quarters. If the export was ruled by the bounty, how happened it that the export increased as the bounty declined virtually with the depreciation of money? These bounties forced capital out of its allotted course, and they cost the nation at least as much as the sum employed in this perversion; and by so much they impaired the nation's ability to subsist itself. These laws of restriction and bounty were imagined by the same penurious intellects which regulated the commerce of grain at home. By the 15th of Charles II. c. 7. s. 4, it is enacted, that when the quarter of wheat doth not exceed 48 shillings, rye 32 shillings, barley or malt 28 shillings, buck wheat 28 shillings, oats 13 shillings, peas and beans 32 shillings,—any person (not forestalling nor selling the same again in three months)

may buy such corn, &c. in open market, at or under such price, and lay it up and sell the same again without incurring any penalty. These are the legislators to whom our present law-giving political œconomists refer their paternity. The judicature of that day equalled the legislature. At the assizes[1] of Kent an indictment was preferred against an individual for engrossing apples, pears, and cherries. He was found guilty. Judgement was arrested; and the body of the argument was, that costermongers were not victuallers by their charters.

Mr. Malthus is a pertinacious advocate for bounties and corn laws: yet he says, "that a rich and commercial nation is thus by the *natural* course of things led more to pasture than tillage[2]." I need not remind the reader how frequently he has used natural as right, and unnatural as wrong;—but what office does the delicate Ariel perform for Prospero on this occasion? Mr. Malthus in his alarms says[3]; "It seems in a great measure to have escaped attention, that a nation which from its extent of territory and population must necessarily support the greater part of its people on the produce of its own soil, but which yet in average years draws a small portion of its corn from abroad, is in a much more precarious situation, with regard to the constancy of its supplies, than such states as draw almost the whole of their provisions from other countries." Why should

[1] Styl. 190.

[2] vol. 2. p. 191. *Nature* is very busy in this part of his work. *Nature* appears at p. 123; *natural* 124; *naturally* and *natural*, 125.

[3] vol. 2. p. 122.

the absurdity,—that a perpetual and almost entire deficiency of provisions is preferable to an occasional and comparatively moderate want of them, have ever been imagined? He then compares the situation of Hamburg and Holland with England: "If they (the demands of Holland) increase gradually, and are not subject from year to year to any great and sudden variations; but it is otherwise with such a country as England: supposing it in average years to want about 400,000 quarters of wheat, such a demand will of course be very easily supplied; but a year of deficient crops occurs, and the demand is suddenly two millions of quarters. If the demand had been on an average two millions, it might have been adequately supplied from the extended agriculture of those countries which are in the habit of exporting corn: but we cannot expect that it can easily be answered thus suddenly."

This is rare reasoning. If the average want be 400,000 quarters, and the extraordinary want be two millions; this is worse, much worse, he says, than if the average want were two millions. Suppose the average want be two millions, I ask why should not the extraordinary want be twice two or twice four millions? for he assumes the average want 400,000 quarters, and the extraordinary want five times greater than the average want. Mr. Malthus, who would render England independent of supplies from foreign nations even at the expense of bounties, argues, that the enormity of an average want is an assurance against all want whatever, ordinary and extraordinary.

Mr. Malthus says[1], "It has been already observed, that we are exactly in the situation in which a country feels most fully the effect of those common years of deficient crops, which in the *natural* course of things are to be expected." What are the facts? By an official return to parliament, it appears that from 1775 to 1786 the average quantity of grain imported into Great Britain amounted to 564,000 quarters; that from 1787 to 1798 the grain amounted annually to 1,136,000 quarters; and that from 1799 to 1810 the average was 1,471,000 quarters. I perceive nothing alarming in this account. Suppose that about 1765 the exported and imported grain were balanced; there is every reason to believe that the population increased considerably from that period to 1801;—and we possess documents which specify that the increase from 1801 to 1811 amounted to 1,654,157 inhabitants. The population has advanced beyond the tillage of the country, yet agriculture has not been inert.

Besides, why should the import of 1,500,000 quarters, which is only equivalent to the national consumption of grain for six weeks, alarm the British? Iceland does not produce grain for a single meal of its 48,000 inhabitants. Malta and Goza and the Sette Commune near Vicenza are dependent on foreigners for their grain, none of them raising corn for three months subsistence in the year. Holland did not grow food for two months in the twelve, said Temple[2]; *nor grain for those only who have the care of its dykes.*

[1] vol. 2. p. 146. [2] Observations on the United Provinces.

Then why should corn laws be necessary to England which were not necessary to Holland? Lord Liverpool thinks, with Mr. Malthus, that the two countries afford no similarity or coincidence; as he said in the debate on the corn laws in 1815, "Great countries are not to be ruled as small ones." This is the misery of men who argue without principles. The longitude or latitude of a country, its dimensions, being peninsular or insular, triangular or rounded,—any and every variation, affords cause to them to except its people from liberality and justice. Lord Liverpool's inference,—that England was not to be ruled as Holland, because England contained much more people,—Mons. Necker applied to France in respect to England. France, said Necker[1], is twice and a fifth more populous than England, Scotland, and Ireland; therefore she cannot be so liberal in her policy in the commerce of grain. False in every respect! for Sully admitted the free export of grain, and by this means chiefly he retrieved agriculture, which had suffered by the civil wars; and Turgot in 1775 reverted to the practice of Sully[2], and with the same success. So much for Mons. Necker's sagacity! Yet is Lord Liverpool still more defenceless. In 1669 the United Provinces contained 2,400,000 inhabitants. Suppose that in 1815 Great Britain contained twelve millions. If Great Britain imported 1,500,000 quarters in that year, and Holland in 1669 did not raise grain for two months subsistence of its people; it fed only 400,000 with home produce, leaving two millions of

[1] Dernières Vues, &c. p. 470.

[2] Bibliothèque de l'Homme Publique, tom. 12. p. 116.

its people dependent on supplies from abroad; while England required grain only for one million and a half of all its people.

Thus Mr. Malthus and Lord Liverpool argue; and I should not notice their misstatements and absurdities if they had been, as far as I know, already exposed. It appears that Mr. Malthus has no doubts of his own sagacity, even while he impugns the conclusions of Adam Smith. On the contrary, he continues an obstinate defender of the corn laws. When the last law, in 1815, was agitated, he published a pamphlet in aid of the ministers and the country gentlemen; in which he stated, "I own it appears to me, that the necessary effect of a change in the measure of value in the weight of a large national debt, is alone sufficient to make the question fundamentally different from that of a simple question about a free and a restricted trade." Had Holland no debt, no taxes? Had she no wars for liberty? and wars in which mighty deeds were executed with inconsiderable means? Twenty-five thousand troops[1], headed by a young man of twenty-two years of age, resisted 130,000 French troops, led by Vauban, Luxembourg, Turenne, and Condé. Yet the Dutch had no corn law;—nor had they a king's splendour to maintain; nor had they ministers with immense salaries and sinecures; nor had they a pensioned nobility:—prince, ministers, and people were laborious, thrifty, and honest. They had not only no corn laws, but the trade of the United Provinces moved on principles the reverse of those of Great Britain: "Lowness of customs and easiness

[1] Voltaire. Louis XIV. c. 9.

of paying them, which, with the freedom of their ports, invite strangers and nations to bring commodities hither, not only as to a market, but as to a magazine, where they lodge till they are invited abroad to other and better markets." Here is a difference indeed! Holland might be called a free port, while England's coast suffers a partial blockade. During the debate on the corn bill in 1815, an argument for the non-importation of foreign corn, except under pains and difficulties, was drawn from the general illiberality of the English commercial code; by which about two hundred articles were similarly repressed by the laws of Great Britain, in order to protect domestic produce or manufactures. The argument was irresistible. Thus the parliament legislated on the same grounds that Macbeth moralized :—

> "——————— I am in blood
> Stept in so far, that, should I wade no more,
> Returning were as tedious as go o'er."

Precedents are legislators' leading-strings.

The excellence of precedents was illustrated by the select committee in their Report on the corn trade in 1813, which Report was the parent of the corn law of 1815. The committee, inverting the order of ancient oratory, began pathetically,—lamented the high price of foreign grain, and the large sums it had cost the country for the last twenty-one years. *Among the evils of so great an importation* they stated *the established high prices of corn.* Yet the average price, according to their statement, for the last twenty-one years, was 77*s.* 3*d.* From these deplorable twenty-one years they turn with some satisfaction to 1812;

because, say they, this did in some manner restore the good old times prior to 1764. In 1812 England resumed the happy custom of exporting grain to foreign countries; the exported grain being in that year 1,493,229 quarters, and the imported only 1,213,850. Here then, in 1812, we may behold precisely the state to which the legislators in 1815 wished permanently to reduce the people of Great Britain; for their bill is but a modification of the report; and both report and bill were passed by the same parliament, and supported by the same individuals. Look to the much-lauded 1812, and the circumstances of the people in that year. In this model year, 1812, the quartern loaf for eight months was at 1*s.* 6½*d.*, and the quarter of wheat in March was enhanced to 122*s.* 8*d.* To this state a patriotic legislature, whose first concern was the labourer and the mechanic, would reduce the people!

We have enjoyed the corn law;—and what promise of its advocates has it fulfilled? It was to keep grain low-priced; and the price was to be the same, or nearly so, at all times and in all years. Besides, it was said to be necessary to our existence as farmers; lest we should, by leaving our ports open, be inundated with grain from France. Yet a few months after the passing of this law, a portion of the imported grain was re-shipped to France; and in June 1817, Mr. Ponsonby, one of the most strenuous advocates for the corn law, called the attention of government to the export of corn from England to France. And so far was the wonder-working corn law from counter-vailing the intemperance of the air and the seasons, and the like, that scarcely had the legislative ma-

chinery begun to act, when this self-regulating instrument became irregular; the pendulum lengthened and increased its swing, its motion was accelerated, and from oscillating it became rotary.

Admirable legislators! who pass laws on the lawyers' dogma—the omnipotence of parliament. You vote that the Walcheren expedition was planned with skill and executed with ability;—that a golden guinea and a pound note with a shilling were of equal value; and you re-affirmed the same the subsequent session, though at these very periods the law-officers of the crown prosecuted Jews and turnpike-men for selling guineas for twenty-seven shillings in bank of England notes;—and you passed corn laws *to serve the people*, to increase the quantity of corn, and to fix and reduce its price! Acts of parliament of prohibition and bounty, to promote agriculture and to reduce prices! To these Mr. Malthus subscribes. Yet he says[1], "The prejudices on the subject of population bear a very striking resemblance to the old prejudices about specie." And this remark appears in a chapter entitled "*On the prevailing errors respecting population and plenty.*" There are no greater prejudices than those in favour of bounties on the exportation of corn.

But then, as memory is stronger than reason, the consequence of the laws of William and Mary and Charles the Second! Suppose that these laws effected the consequences ascribed to them—whence the superlative benefit to the British of eating their own wheat without the mixture of foreign grain? Home-

[1] vol. 2. p. 208.

made, home-fed, home-bred, says the housewife: and, to exalt the illustration, the Persian kings could drink only of the water of the Euphrates. Why is it best, or good, that Britain should grow her own wheat exclusively? For the first fifty years of the last century England exported grain,—from 1783 to 1793 she imported largely;—was she less prosperous or powerful during that interval than in the exporting periods of her history? If we are to be ruled by precedents, let us revive the whole alimentary code. By the 31st of Edward I. the chancellor is ordered to regulate the buying and selling of stock-fish of St. Botolph and salmon of Berwick. And in Henry the Eighth's reign the chancellor's office was extended to the appraisement of poultry, beef, veal, cheese, and butter. Let no one say that all this is obsolete, for in 1815, when the parliament passed the corn law,—that grand assize of grain,—it also extended its saving sagacity to native cheese and domestic butter.

These are not the only monstrous views which this subject exhibits. We were told, that if we did not prohibit importation we should be overborne with foreign grain; while we were advised to consider that other countries produced so little beyond their own consumption, that if we did not cultivate grain,—no matter at what cost and inconvenience,—we should subject ourselves to want, scarcities, and famine. Of all terrors and conceits, that of starving an opulent powerful nation is the most fantastic. England tried to intercept the supply of provisions to France; and England, by Bonaparte's decrees and her own orders in council, was excluded from foreign assistance more

effectually than any combination of enemies could possibly accomplish. A rich approachable country is always the least insecure of want of provisions; no matter whether it grows them or not. A rich country will be supplied before a less opulent or poorer one; though this produced the grain, the richer country will command it; for the holders of the produce will prefer those who pay the largest price, and those are the richest. It is therefore, not whether more or less is grown or exported or imported; the richest nation is the most secure from want. Where there are riches, there will be comparative plenty; and this must continue so long as men are moved by pleasure, and wealth is an agent in human affairs. Poland produced much of that grain which fed the Hollanders; and Poland and other agricultural countries have wanted food when Holland was amply provided. So in other particulars, Sir W. Temple says[1], there is more silver seen in Holland than brass in Spain and France.

The corn law was absurd and vicious, and it was lyingly and insultingly proposed and carried. The parliament passed it to serve the people! Legislators said so; though it was avowedly enacted to enhance the price of home-grown corn. Then it serves the people to pay a higher price for their bread; and therefore Peter, in the Tale of a Tub, was a matter-of-fact reasoner. If the parliament passed it to serve the people, it stands in the code as the city in the wilderness—wonderful in itself, and still more marvellous by the contrast which surrounds it—for where shall we find another statute sympathizing with the

[1] vol. 1. p. 66.

people! The fact is, the corn law was a short-sighted attempt to indemnify the country gentlemen who supported the war, by giving them and their farmers a monopoly of the prime necessary against all the people. Who believes that monopolies serve any but the monopolists? The corn law proposed that monopoly for the proprietors of land. The reign of Queen Elizabeth was disgraced by grants of various monopolies: "When a list of them," says Hume, "was read in the house, a member cried, Is not bread a monopoly? Bread! said every one with astonishment. Yes, I assure you, replied he, if affairs go on at this rate, we shall have bread reduced to a monopoly before next parliament[1]." This the parliament of 1815 endeavoured to effect.

CHAPTER VII.

Principal causes of poverty in England—the expense of the monarchy—namely, many courts, the nobility, the ecclesiastical establishment, the House of Commons, the national debt, subsidies, wars, military establishments, pensioners, sinecurists,—which are contrary to custom and precedents, to common sense and common honesty. The circumstances of England and America contrasted.
—REFORM.

THE people are poor, and growing poorer. The cause of this seems to me no mystery. Some say, The more you give them the more they want. The misapplication of funds may increase the mendicant order, I admit; but the poor in England increase not by what is given, but by what is subtracted from the

[1] History, vol. 5. p. 439.

people. The wealth of states was derived from labour, and by labour it must be sustained. It seems equally clear that a certain profit is necessary to support capital, and certain wages to support labour. Thence it follows, that after a certain charge on capital it will escape abroad or perish at home; that this will affect the wages of labour, as it curtails the means of employment; and should wages, beside their depreciation in consequence, be lessened by direct or indirect charges, poverty must ensue. That this has happened, I shall evince by a recital of the repeated and enormous impositions on the people of England [1].

The British constitution is excellent. This has been ardently asserted at all times, and by the best authorities; by the commons house of parliament and its chiefs; by the lords, by the king, by the bishops, by the judges, by Lord Ellenborough, by Lord Mansfield, by Jefferies, by Finch, who insisted "None other can share with him (the king) his absolute power [2];" by Coventry, who defended ship-money; "so gracious," said this lord-keeper, "is the frame and constitution of the king's government [3]." In short, the British constitution is always best, whatever changes it may undergo; and its excellence is commonly most applauded, when the greatest crimes are perpetrated against liberty under its supposed sanction: nor have I any doubt but that the beauty of the law and constitution was praised, as we have heard it praised, in Richard the

[1] This chapter refers to the poverty of the English. In another work I shall take a general view of the poor;—this present chapter is a restricted disquisition.

[2] State Trials, vol. 1. p. 769.

[3] Ibid. vol. 1. p. 566.

Second's reign, when Sir Thomas Haxey[1] was condemned to die the death of a traitor, for having moved in the house of commons that œconomy should be promoted at court; and that to attain this purpose the court should not be so much frequented by *bishops and ladies*. The constitution may then be called sacred,—consecrated by prescription; it is the best that ever existed. Then why should it not be the dearest; and why should not it, as it grows better than the best, annually increase its incredible expense according to its superlative perfection?

First stands the king, the πϑ στω, the *point d'appuie* of the system. The crown, so far back as 1810, received of droits 7,344,000*l.*; it received also, as far back as 1812, of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Leeward Island duties, 1,600,000*l.* The Prince Regent received also the revenues of the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster[2], which revenues would of themselves support four or five hundred working families. The debts of the crown and of the prince have also been frequently paid by the people. Yet these enormous sums are but the extraordinaries of the royal revenue. The civil list amounts to nearly two millions a year. Above half a million[3] of the civil list is expended on the personal accommodation and private account of the Prince Regent.

[1] Cotton's Abridgement, p. 362. Reeves, &c. vol. 3. p. 218.

[2] How much does he receive from crown lands in Hanover?

[3] That is the sum allowed: yet it appears by an account presented to the house of commons, that for one quarter of a year ending 5th July 1814, the sum expended was 199,195*l.*; nor did this include the whole expense of that quarter.

This has alarmed many: but they should be told, indeed they cannot be told too often, the maxim is self-evident, That the king can do no wrong,—which is essentially true; for, according to the constitution, he can do nothing [1], say nothing. The constitution considers his acts in council, and speeches in parliament, the acts and speeches of ministers. The king of England, no matter who, is by nature angelic, and his government a mysterious energy. If then a minister, to whom the constitution attributes actions and language, receive ten or twenty thousand pounds a year, on the supposition that he exercises his functions [2], the king, or his *locum tenens*, whose characteristic is goodness, and whose power is divine, is not overpaid by many millions.

Besides, those who censure such prodigality err in supposing that, because these sums are charged to the prince or to the crown, they are expended for individual or private purposes. Who has hot heard of the splendour of the throne? A Spanish ambassador, being irritated by his master, who rebuked him for quitting congress for a ceremony, replied, "A ceremony! your majesty is but a ceremony." All talk—loyalists and reformers speak so much of the splendour of the throne, and so little of the virtue and wisdom and

[1] We now and then hear of a king and a prince writing a letter *with his own hand*:—this we should say emphatically of one who had marvellously recovered the use of his members, of which he had long been deprived.

[2] Horace Walpole says, that on the Duke of Newcastle leaving the ministry a closet of dispatches from America was found unopened.

knowledge of kings, that an over-curious person might be disposed to inquire into the paramount importance of burnishing the royal arms, and the chair of state, and the sceptre. Whom does this splendour serve? Not the king; for it is doubtful if a summer-fly rejoices in its hues even when it plays Adonis, and overlooks the flood. Can it serve the people? can it captivate them? Few have an opportunity of a transitory glance at the splendour of the throne. The splendour of the throne can serve few but carvers and gilders, and the like.

But I may be told that the splendour of the throne regards the palace, the equipage, the officers of the household, the gentlemen pensioners, and servants "plastered with gold." This brings the royal majesty within the circle of final causes; for Chrysippus said, A peacock was made for the beauty of his tail [1]. Of the court which costs so much, and where the crown exhibits all its glories, Sir W. Temple says [2], "A court, properly a fair, the end of it trade or gain, for none would come to be jostled in a crowd that is easy at home, nor go to service, that thinks he has enough to live with himself." The contemporary of Temple,

[1] Ο ταως ενεκα της ϐρας γεγονε δια το καλλος αυτης. Plutarch. Moral. p. 465.

[2] Works, vol. 1. p. 312. Madame de Stael has given, in her "Germany," a most humiliating account of the nobles and court of Austria: yet to these, twenty-five millions of men, got together by every violence, are sacrificed,—and this is legitimacy. The disposition of the government is to sink men of superior merit. p. 63. "Noblemen of rank take their promenade on horses or in carriages of the greatest magnificence and good taste:—all their amusement consists in bowing in an alley of the Prater to those whom they

John Milton, when the expense of the monarchy was not equal to one item in the modern account-royal, lamented the cost of a monarchy. Johnson, who called Milton a surly republican, resists the charge, stating that Milton is ignorant and absurd; "that the support and expense of a court are for the most part only a particular kind of traffic, by which money is circulated without any national impoverishment." This is a new view of commerce. A court is therefore a national mart, in which the king's mistress is a great trader. How ignorant then were "they of Tarsus and Mallos, (who) made insurrection because they were given to the king's concubine," of political œconomy. According to this mercantile doctrine, though "they that wear soft clothing are in king's houses," yet are they factors; and henceforward the court calendar must be considered as an appendix to the list of merchants and traders. The whole of this topic —the splendour of the crown, its traffic, &c.—is exemplified by a circumstance related by Park [1]. This traveller was introduced to an original king of Africa. His majesty, under various pretences, courteously deprived him of a variety of articles. At last he begged Park's coat, which of course he obtained; but he assured Park that he would wear it on all public occasions for his sake.

have just left in a drawing-room." p. 75. "All the good company transports itself, *en masse*, from one drawing-room to another three or four times every week. A certain time is lost in the duties of the toilet, which are necessary in these great assemblies; more is lost in the streets and on the staircases, waiting till the carriages draw up in order; still more in sitting three hours at table." p. 82.

[1] Travels, p. 55.

Beside the crown and court-royal, there are other courts: the king's court at Windsor is upheld at an expense of 220,000*l.* a year. Then the queen's court—*hic domus est triplex*. Besides these are many minor principalities; and all of them have had their treasures increased, in proportion to the debts and incumbrances of the monarchy: nay, in the midst of the national distress in 1816, 260,000*l.* were added to the civil list; and the ministers Castlereagh and Vansittart, in the same year, requested that 6000*l.* might be added to the Duke of Cumberland's pension, that the duke and duchess might live with *proper dignity and splendour*;—such were the words of their application.

To the expense of the crown succeeds that of the nobility. Judge Blackstone informs us, "A body of nobility is also more particulary necessary in our mixed and compounded constitution, in order to support the rights of both the crown and people, by forming a barrier to withstand the encroachments of both." Then the constitution consists of king and commons, and the nobility form an armed neutrality. Excellent commentator! Yet suppose it, How are the people's rights to be protected by having their chief men withdrawn by the king from among themselves, and placed among his own favourites[1]? To support the people against the crown, by the prerogative listing the chiefs of the people in the king's service, may be considered among the peculiar felicities of our constitution.

[1] Hominum nobilium non fere quisquam nostræ industriæ favit, nullis nostris officiis benevolentiam illorum allicere possumus; quasi natura et genere disjuncti sunt, ita dissident a nobis animo ac voluntate. Cicero in Verrem, t. 2. p. 217.

Blackstone[1] announces another dogma, which is more to the present purpose. Having praised the right of the king to ennoble, he adds, "in order to reward such as are eminent for their services to the public, in a manner the most desirable to individuals, and yet without a burthen to the community." The remark is shallow and false: a body of nobility is an expense, merely as so many are separated and elevated above the people. Part of Sweden's misery is referable to its increasing nobles, and the lazzaroni are the effects of a numerous Neapolitan nobility[2]. Where there are many eminences there will be corresponding valleys; and as the hill ascends, the land becomes sterile and the climate austere; while the surrounding country, north, east, and west, is swept with the chill of its circling shadow. But it is not merely by removing men from citizens to a lordly state, that now in England and Ireland they become burthensome—a title and a pension are common associates[3].

Blackstone and the eulogists of king-ennobling may talk of the indescribable propriety of granting a title to men *eminent for their services*, "Et nobilitatur Rhegium patinis." But how can a British title ennoble, except technically; when not long after the Revolution, a draft was made from the commons to the house of lords, to effect a ministerial majority? when for a similar purpose, in 1777, another batch was drafted

[1] Commentaries, b. 1. c. 2. p. 157.

[2] Scipione Mazzelli considered that he eulogized his country, by saying that Naples had more nobility than all Italy. Storia, &c. p. 607.

[3] This adjunct was refused by Lord Hopetoun.

into the House of Lords:—and how often did William Pitt follow the same regimental precedent! in 1797 ten peers were made. He nearly created the order of marquises; he made ten marquises in England, where there was one; and nine in Ireland, where there were none—all men of course eminent for their *services*. He also rivalled King James in conferring knighthood on all men eminent for their services; Sir Judkin Fitzgerald and the like. What is transubstantiation to this?

Without questioning whether one man can ennoble another, it may be doubted, when individuals are sent to the upper house as freeholders are sent to the pollbooth, whether true honour is not tarnished by the peerage. I believe this would have been determined in the affirmative by Queen Elizabeth. She was asked to create General Vere a baron; she answered, "that in her estimation he was above it already; and to make him one, would be to hazard that repute upon a carpet, that his valour had already earned in the field[1]." How many have been carpet-wrecked!—Saville, Pulteney, Pitt. Honour Pitt with the title of Lord Chatham, add 3000*l.* to support the splendour of his nobility! Glorious prerogative of royalty! Then sacred be Nero's latest egotism, "A consummate artist dies[2]." Nero gilded a statue of Phidias, and George the Third ennobled William Pitt.

Now the nobility are a direct charge: first, the man of merit is minted, and then the royal arms must be emblazoned, that his lordship may live in becoming

[1] Cayley's Life of Sir Walter Raleigh, p. 72.

[2] Qualis artifex pereo.

splendour; for in every thing the nobleman partakes of the monarch, just as radiant caloric is a constituent part of the solar ray. The king enjoys hundreds of thousands; so does the old peer a potent sinecure, or the new one a large pension. The last-made peer, Mr. Abbot, having enjoyed lucrative offices all his life, and having profited by them, was called to the upper house: and *to support the peerage*—such is the court cant—beside a sinecure of 1,500*l.* in Ireland for his *eminent services* in that country, a pension of 4000*l.* was added by the House of Commons[1]. Thus the public money is squandered, and the people impoverished. When England comparatively had no debt, Sir James Steuart, who saw the character of a nobility differently from Justice Blackstone, said, "If you cannot afford to have a nobility, let it die away[2]." But now, when we are with pretences and expedients, lotteries, exchequer bills *provided for* by redrawing others, and loans from the Bank, and paper issues, respiting the day of national insolvency; we increase our nobility, and their pensions also.

Whether the ecclesiastical establishment should not precede in these strictures the nobility, may be doubted. Perhaps I should at once demand forgiveness; for as Finch gave precedence to kings before the commons in respect of time, Laud, who asserted "No bishop no king," also presumed "there were Christian bishops before there were Christian kings."

[1] It is said that the house, furniture, &c. of Mr. Abbot cost the nation 200,000*l.*; but then he was such a Speaker! So was Mr. Addington.

[2] Political Œconomy, vol. 1. p. 65.

That *episcopus* appears in the New Testament is certain, and *episcopus* is translated *bishop;* but to infer a similarity of office between existing bishops and bishops in the apostolical age, on account of identity of name, might startle a mere grammarian. If names decidedly fix the characters of those to whom they are ascribed, parasite and bishop are one and the same; as formerly parasite was a revered and sacred title[1], and his office particularly regarded the holy food[2]. Again, if a title determine the kindred, our bishops might be reputed successors of the priesthood of Diana; for there was in Pagan times, Diana the episcopal[3]. Mosheim speaks thus of bishops, past and present; "Let no one confound the bishops of this primitive and golden period of the church, with those of whom we read in the following; for though they were both designated by the same name, yet they differed extremely in many respects. A bishop during the first and second century had the care of one Christian assembly, in which he acted not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant."

Bishops in after-times reversed this character; and, in defiance of the rebuke of him, whom they call their master, to his disciples, "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant," bishops assume

[1] Το τϐ παρασιτϐ ονομα παλαι ην σεμνον και ιερον. Athenæus, lib. 4.

[2] Την τϐ ιερου σιτϐ εκλογην αἱρουμενος. Crates de Attic. Dialect. lib. 2.

[3] Plutarch. Moral. p. 182.

superiority over all laymen[1], and over each other: nay Burke, uttering in oracular terms his Delphic raptures,

"Os rabidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premendo,"

insists, "We [our provident constitution] will have her [religion] to exalt her mitred front in courts and parliaments"—"We can see without pain or grudging, an archbishop precede a duke[2]." False throughout! We grudge it—the people grudge it, and they show their dissatisfaction by separating from the establishment, the only way their wretched representation admits them to express their sentiments. A lord may rejoice at seeing a bishop at levee; for he is probably his brother, or cousin, or tutor. The people grudge—for what do the bishops for their stipend? Old Latimer reviled *unpreaching prelates*, and he directed them, "Learn of the devil to be diligent in doing of your office."

What do the aspirants at episcopacy? They labour not. Spencer says that in Hebrew and in Greek, "Six days shalt thou labour" is a command[3]. And Paolo Sarpi says, "Men were commanded to eat bread by the sweat of their brow. Now the clergy might as well pretend to have been created free from original sin as from this curse; though they are the executioners of it, by selling again to the laity that bread which

[1] The presumption of the clergy that they are the church, is not apostolical, it is among the corruptions of after ages.

[2] Reflections on the French Revolution, p. 152.

[3] De Legib. Hebr. p. 46.

they received from their ancestors under the title of alms[1]." But our constitution will not allow them to work. St. Paul did work with his hands, that he might not be a burthen to his congregation: but Mr. Burke would have surmounted his head with a mitre, and given him precedence in the courts of Tiberius and Nero.

What do the superior clergy? I speak not of the bishops professionally as spiritual pastors. Do they not preclude the most credulous from believing they can perform any service for the salaries they wring from the people? Some years since, a bill was brought into parliament to enforce residence. On this, the penalties incurred for non-residence were so numerous, that in a following session an indemnity bill was introduced, exonerating these unjust stewards from paying their forfeitures. Thus the parliament stultified its own laws, and an innovated benefit of clergy was passed, in order to evince the perfect union between church and state. In Henry the Eighth's time there were 200 dispensations for pluralities, now there are 2000; and last session, Mr. Gordon, in the debate on Mr. Sutton's 'Clergy Residence Bill,' said he knew a clergyman who was dignitary in no less than six cathedrals. Lord Redesdale also, when the same bill was debated in the House of Lords, said, that the mischiefs arising from the non-residence of the *lower* clergy were experienced in all parts of the kingdom; —he said curates had been non-residents. Nearly one half of the clergy of the established church are non-residents.

[1] Rights of Sovereigns, p. 180.

Yet resident or non-resident, the clergy of the establishment are paid by the people; by the very labour of the people; by tithes, which Paley truly denominated most pernicious. It is a rent uncertain and inequitable; for the tithe may be the whole profit of the crop: it is a rent in advance; a tax on labour and capital; a penalty on agriculture; a prohibition to improve inferior lands, for lands will pay one rent, which cannot pay both proprietor and priest; and lands will return a profit to the cultivator, which cannot afford either rent or tithe. All these lands by tithing are condemned to barrenness. Few can imagine the ruin of this vexatious and barbarous imposition on population and tillage. Observe the effect of an inconsiderable impost. Mathison says, in his Notices on Jamaica, that in 1810 the tillage of 87,000 acres was suspended, in order to escape the payment of three-pence an acre. What then must be the effect of tithes in the present state of this country?

Yet, what import these considerations? Have the clergy reduced their tithes? Have the non-residents and pluralists taken counsel of St. Paul, who said, that those who do not work neither shall they eat; and stinted their appetite? No; they show their orthodoxy as Bel did his godship:—the priests of Bel having daily consumed twelve measures of fine flour and forty sheep and six vessels of wine, Babylon's king exclaimed, "Great art thou, O Bel! and with thee is no deceit." No species of property has advanced so rapidly as the stipends of the clergy[1]: in

[1] See the Communications to the Board of Agriculture, vol. 5.

14 years (from 1790 to 1804) tithe had increased forty-eight per cent.

This was a subject for parliamentary investigation and legislative amendment; and not a corn law prohibiting the people from foreign grain. Yet during the debates on the corn bill in 1815, nothing was suggested respecting tithes. Compare this silence with the loquacity of a former period. The House of Commons in the 6th of Henry IV. proposed, in place of granting new supplies, that the temporalities of the church should be seized for the exigencies of the state: and they assigned as their reason, that the riches of the clergy disqualified them from their duties. They repeated the same in the 11th of the same king, when they required that fifteen thousand parish priests, with moderate stipends, should be substituted for the church establishment then existing. Hume expresses justly his surprise at such extraordinary efforts against the church; when by the by he says, "The Commons showed a laudable zeal for liberty in their transactions with the crown." Four hundred years after (in 1815), the Commons showed no disposition for liberty or justice.

The proposal of the British Commons has been executed, and at no greater distance from England than the breadth of the Tweed. The Scotch reformed their church: and, fortunately for their own dignity and the good of posterity, they were not, like our valetudinarians on principle, unmeaning moderate reformers. The king and the parliament unanimously favoured an ecclesiastical establishment —the people resisted. They resisted James the First,

who from a presbyterian apostatized to episopacy. This very James, who said[1], "If you aim at Scottish presbytery, it agrees as well with monarchy as God and the devil." They resisted Charles the Martyr, who said, No bishop no king: and Charles the Profligate, who insisted that presbyterianism was not a religion for a gentleman; whose vigorous government declared that non-abjuring the presbyterian religion was a capital offence[2]; and which hunted and shot the conventiclers in pure love of king, and bishops, and Christianity. The Scotch immoderately and wisely resisted and reformed the clerical orders, in opposition to church and state, and kings, nobles, bishops, parliament and military; and the Scotch now live without bishops[3], without tithes, and effectually without poor laws.

What is the consequence? The clergy are all sufficiently paid;—none are mendicants and houseless, none are wallowing in wealth and literally enthroned in palaces: the business of the Scottish church is competently executed; and the people profit by the advice and example of their pastors. This reform operates morally and physically. The Scotch, with a harsher climate and less grateful soil, pay greater rents than the English, are better farmers, and make their land more productive. The reason is obvious:

[1] Hume, vol. 6. p. 14.

[2] "In 1684 the privy council ordained that whosoever owned, or refused to disown, the declaration (adherence to the Presbyterian form of worship), should be put to death in the presence of two witnesses, though unarmed when taken." Bowyer's History of the University of Edinburgh, vol. 1. p. 307.

[3] There are some inconsiderable remains of that system.

they are not tormented with tithe proctors and tithing parsons—publicans and sinners. They know what they are to pay; their rent is fixed in consequence of a civil contract for an equivalent; tithe, which is as barbarous as lefsilver—(a fine paid by the customary tenant to the lord for leave to plough and sow) they suffer not. No other cause can sufficiently explain how Scotland, which a century ago was so poor, so wretched, so ignorant, so immoral—now equals England in all circumstances which deserve competition,—but the better footing of its church establishment. Superior climate and soil and situation England still possesses; and she had enjoyed without rivalry superior wealth, improved machinery, and more civilized habits, many years before Scotland had emerged from the depths of feudal barbarism: yet now all is inverted, and England follows North Britain. The Scotch have no poor-rates; they have no tithe; the people are better educated; they have parochial schools; they have a diligent moralizing clergy, springing from the people, and not falling among them from aloft like meteoric stones, they know not whence. As the clergy are derived from the people, they in gratitude and duty serve the people.

We are told, a tree is known by its fruit. But this is not here directly the consideration, but the pauperizing effects of the ecclesiastical establishment. Compare its charges—its onerous charges on population and subsistence, and the freewill offerings to the Scottish clergy; who when Adam Smith wrote were supported for 60 or 70,000*l.*;—while the clergy

of the ecclesiastical establishment of England and Ireland cost the people in tithe and territory eight or ten millions sterling. Nor are they satisfied with these sums; every year 100,000*l.* (perhaps all the Scottish clergy do not cost more) is granted by parliament to the clergy of this very establishment: nay, churches are built out of the exchequer of the state. The fact is, the church establishment has no sympathy with the people. Mr. Simeon says[1]; "There are about 11,000 places of worship in the established church, and about as many out of it." There are more: yet by this account it appears that there is no want of zeal in the people, as the Dissenters from the church, though taxed to support the establishment, build churches and support their ministers out of their own unassisted funds, which is an improvement on the Presbyterian church of Scotland; and unless we suppose that Protestants would have less regard for their clergy, if they were not forced on the people, there is no reason for concluding that a Protestant ministry should not be treated with equal affection and more generosity; as in this country Protestants are the opulent order. Yet we must not think of reforming this church establishment when the separatists are so numerous, and though they increase prodigiously. It has been estimated, that though during the first years of his majesty's reign Dissenting places of worship had increased beyond all former periods, they have during the last 14 years exceeded the first 14 years of this reign as

[1] Sermon on the Excellency of the Liturgy, preached before the University of Cambridge.

five to one. Thus while churches empty, the conventicle fills. In the parish of St. Pancras, there is one church which can contain about 200 persons: the population amounts to 40,000; yet the parishioners think this church sufficient. If the people's money is forced one way, while they go another, second-sight is not necessary to perceive that there must be a radical reform in the church establishment.

Having placed ecclesiastics after the nobility, (for which I request their excuse,) I proceed to the House of Commons—the double belt of Jupiter.

To exhibit this gratuitous representation of the people, of which less than two hundred individuals nominate a majority, would be a wretched office. I speak only of their expense to the nation, and by this expense their pauperizing effects. It may be truly said, that the great majority of seats in parliament are bought and sold, and many bought and sold with perjury and bribery and the subornation of many vices. What they want in honour is required in emolument; and thus a seat is considered a presentation for self, or, what is more common, for children and dependants, to various offices and emoluments. The frame of the House of Commons is new, is an innovation not only in the prolongation of parliament, but in respect to the views and conduct of its members. No one formerly presumed to consider the representation of the people in parliament a vested interest; and yet the porers into legendary lore affect to be ruled by precedents. A *printed* petition,—monstrous! Then Mr. Wynn, the speaker in expectation, says, that this question was agitated in 1656, and that a petition

from Nottingham was rejected in 1813: these entries[1], he says, established the rule. So in these legitimate times the House of Commons can take a precedent from Cromwell's creatures! and on this ground 468 petitions of the people were rejected. No reason was suggested; the parliament stuck to the precedent of 1656. It was a desperate hint to pregnant imaginations, and might lead to unreasonable precedents. Yet while the Commons rejected 468 petitions on this quiddit, started originally by a revolutionary government, the ministry prosecuted Mr. Wooler for ridiculing the right of petitioning, and which they made more than ridiculous. I remember, that some years since a determination not to petition was considered evidence of proneness in the people to sedition. What if it were proved that for centuries the House of Commons received only written petitions? and that before this, petitions were *viva voce?* for printing succeeded writing, and writing discourse. Suppose it were the practice during the Norman, Danish, and Saxon dynasties—what then? "Antiquissimum id habendum est quod optimum[2]."—But I speak of the expense of the house.

Bribery and seat-selling are later than the grand period of rejecting printed petitions. We read, in-

[1] Why are amendments printed? Is this practice older than 1656?

[2] Cicero, tom. 4. p. 338. Coke says of parliament; "Si antiquitatem spectes vetustissima, si dignitatem honoratissima, si jurisdictionem capacissima." 4 Instit. 36. And of the law of parliament he says, "Ab omnibus quærenda, a multis ignorata, a paucis cognita." 1 Instit. 11.

deed, of a mayor who in 1571 received four pounds for a seat in parliament; which Hume[1] supposes were given, as the seat afforded a privilege from arrest:—a seat in parliament being them burthensome. We read also of *undertakers*[2] who were employed to obtain a majority in James the First's time. But according to Sir W. Temple[3], and there is no better authority, bribery and seat-selling came with the Restoration. Temple says, the court party grew numerous in parliament "by a practice introduced by Lord Clifford, of downright buying off one man after another as they could make the bargain." It was a good precedent, and thrived wonderfully;

> "In the porch Briareus stands,
> Shows a bribe in all his hands."

H. Walpole writes, that his father, Sir R. Walpole, used to say, it was fortunate few could be principal ministers, as thus few could thoroughly know the shocking wickedness of mankind. At last the world begins to know a little of the grand management of the House of Commons, the guardian in advance of our inimitable constitution. And most certainly the prize offered by George the Third in 1769 to the students of the Royal Academy, for the best painting on TIME DISCOVERING TRUTH, should be awarded to the present ministers. The plot, the reports of the secret committees, the seditious meetings bill, the suspension of the habeas corpus act—that outlawry of all the people—the relegation of the electors of Westminster from Palace-yard, Lord Sidmouth's circular,

[1] Hume, vol. 5. p. 183. [2] Ibid. vol. 6. p. 71. [3] vol. 1. p. 458.

the fomented insurrection, the trials, the convictions, the acquittals, the moral ostensible agents—Reynolds[1] and Castles, and Oliver and Bradley, and their parliamentary compurgators,—exhibit the *truth* of parliaments and ministers, to use a poet's expression, "all naked and raw life."

Of all modern departures from ancient practice by the House of Commons, none is more flagrant and enormous than their huge prodigality of the public money, emphatically the people's money. On this point their predecessors had been always chary. In all times tyranny could not force, fear could not extort, even an assurance of thrifty application and on occasions of great pith and moment was ineffectual to induce the House of Commons to lavish the public money. Hume[2], speaking of Elizabeth's reign, "Nor could the authority of that princess, which was otherwise almost absolute, ever extort from them the requisite supplies." Yet during the present reign the minister—no matter who, when, or for what,—ever wanted supplies, whatever was the amount of his demand. The reason is obvious. In the former periods of our history, the money voted was paid equally by the voters and their families and the people; and little was returned either to the voters or their families. Now, when the House of Commons votes millions, a share of this supply they or their families or dependants receive in advance by premiums on loans, by enhancing the price of money, by contracts, by

[1] On Oliver Bond's trial I heard him admit in detail, that he five times perjured himself.

[2] vol. 6., p. 202.

offices, by pensions, &c. The perniciousness of loans was exhibited by the failure of the income tax. Here the legislators counted that they should pay more than they and theirs could gain by the impost. Had the ministry reconnoitred the money market, as they did afterward, by means of the bank directors, œconomy would have been echoed as feebly as reform; for the commons house of parliament voted the estimates and sanctioned a loan, equal to the income tax.

The waste of the people's money by the House of Commons is almost incredible. William Pitt attributed former wars to the corruption of the House of Commons[1]; and he insisted, that without reform the nation would be hurried into new debts and new wars, and that no honest minister could serve the nation. He gave the argument and the example—the prophet marvellously accomplished his own prediction.

It is wonderful how any nation could support such universal waste. The British subsidized almost every nation in Europe with many millions; and she alternately fought and subsidized the same nation; she became security also for some, and of course liquidated their debts. She bound herself for Austria to her own money-lenders; and she pays them, and must continue to pay them. She remitted ten millions ster-

[1] He called in 1782 the defect of the representation the *national disease*; adding, "Without a parliamentary reform the nation will be plunged into *new wars*; without a parliamentary reform you cannot be secure against bad ministers, nor can good ministers be of use to you. No honest man, according to the system, can be minister."

ling to the French[1], due for the maintenance of their prisoners, as part of the bonus for their submission to Louis. She pensioned the emigrant French priests, and continues to pay them. She paid Ferdinand's travelling expenses from Valencia to Madrid; Louis the Eighteenth's from London to Paris; the Pope's from Bologna to Rome. She, to please the Prince, raised a monument to the last of the Stuarts. Yet all these were but the outward flourishes of the waste and prodigality of our sad government.

For what has been the waste of our own warlike achievements? Mons. Calonne argued[2], that since the French revolution, four campaigns, with all the profusions, dilapidations, expenses, &c. did not cost France one-fourth of the expenditure of England in one year of war. And it is ascertained by accounts printed by order of the House of Commons, that for 1797, the year after Calonne made this observation, to January 1817, the gross revenue of Great Britain amounted to twelve hundred and ninety-two millions one hundred and eighty thousand five hundred and ninety-two pounds five shillings and three half-pence. This has vanished, and a debt has accumulated during

[1] This immense sum was remitted under the subterfuge of a comparatively inconsiderable sum being paid to private creditors of the French crown. Yet the most scandalous delays and subterfuges have been practised by the legitimate government of Louis; and in no instance has a substantial payment been made of the debts authenticated by the commissioners in 1814. And the same conduct is now pursued respecting the support of the army of occupation, who will soon retreat.

[2] Tableau de l'Europe jusqu'au Commencement de 1796. p. 68.

the same period of eight hundred millions. If to these sums we add four years' expense from the beginning of the war in 1793 to 1797, and all the local charges connected with the war, providing substitutes for the militia, &c.—this war, in favour originally of the Gallican church, and the noblesse of France, and the Bourbons, against reformation and the people's rights, from its beginning to the second restoration of Louis, cost Great Britain and Ireland thirty hundred millions sterling. Who supplied this? The people, constitutionally speaking, the commonalty of this realm. Yet the means by which these mighty sums were wrung from the people aggravated the enormity. Have the overweening friends of the constitution supported precedent on these occasions, either in the waste of the people's substance, or in the means of extracting it from them? At the Revolution of England, two shillings on every fire-hearth was taken off[1], "because," says the preamble of the repealing act, "it was not only a great oppression to the poorer sort, but a badge of slavery on the whole people; exposing every man's house to be entered into and searched at pleasure by persons unknown to him." What was this tax to *extents in aid*, which have ceased in some degree as flames on ship-board cease by the sinking of the vessel? What was the hearth-tax to that inquisitorial tax on income, when a man's cabinet was laid open, and he sworn to his secret drawers? What was the hearth-tax to the more inquisitorial

[1] Ireland still suffers this tax of course.

tax than that on income, the 55th of Geo. III. c. 184. respecting duties on legacies[1], &c.? What was the hearth-tax to the taxes on soap, leather, tobacco, salt? At Droitwich salt costs thirty-one pounds the ton, thirty pounds of which are duty; this is twenty times a greater tax than the hearth-tax. The senate of Rome—no very sentimental body—remitted the tax on salt, saying it was enough for the poor to support their children[2].

In consequence of such sums so extorted, the distribution of justice is a vain name; and the people become poorer and more vicious—"The vice of the poor is their poverty:"—and because the people would resume their rights, would elect those who are called the representatives of the people, would have *actual* representatives, (let their opponents enjoy *virtual* pensions and *virtual* sinecures,) &c. they are treated as outcasts and rebels. The ministry are fond of recurring to precedents. Chateaubriand's authority will not be questioned by the friends of the king and legitimacy: he says, "No sooner did the spirit of liberty make its appearance [prior to the French revolution] than *lettres de cachet* were multiplied: these letters caused, no doubt, more noise than mischief; but they were, it must be confessed, subversive of every legitimate principle[3]." This precedent the British ministry has followed; and many last year were imprisoned

[1] I have known the heir charged more for the tax or duty than he derived from the inheritance.

[2] See Machiavel's Discorsi, p. 61.

[3] Essay on the Revolution, p. 61.

without charge or trial. The church also followed a precedent at home[1]; and all good Protestants prayed against the madness of the people. Let the ministry remember, that it is proved by repeated publications, that kindness is the most effectual means of curing the insane, and that bad usage frequently drives the diseased to fury. Yet the remedies applied to the popular disposition for reform and œconomy are severe laws drawn strictly; new and severe interpretations; laws against meetings, against associations, against personal liberty; imprisonment without trial; trials in which a copy of the information would not be granted; for, said Lord Ellenborough in the case of Hone, *we have no funds out of which to pay the expense of making the copy.* Yet funds were at hand to array some twelve or twenty lawyers to prosecute the dupes of Oliver, the government spy. It was however signified to Mr. Hone that he might have copies on paying nine pounds. All no doubt conformable to the maxim of administering justice in mercy[2], and to

[1] Hume, speaking of the clergy in the reign of Charles the Martyr, says, "So disgusted were all friends of civil liberty at the doctrines promoted by the clergy, that these invectives were received without control." vol. 6. p. 384.

[2] We heard last session of the king's jails, and the mercy taught on that occasion. I imagine, considering some trials, &c. as Muir's and Lord Halifax's, that the axiom should be—Justice and mercy. Thus a friend to liberty obtains justice, as Muir, and is transported for fourteen years, for telling a friend he will find a certain book in his great-coat pocket. But a minister who would murder liberty obtains mercy. Halifax, who acted against freedom, obtained a privy seal from the king, that he should be indemnified for any damages granted by a jury for his wickedness. Annual Register, 1769, p. 151. This is mercy, and the brightest jewel in the crown!

Magna Charta, by which kings swore they would not sell, deny, or delay justice.

"L'injustice à la fin produit l'indépendence."

The people groan under aggravated oppression, and they are insulted, spurned, slandered;—told of the splendour of the monarchy, and of the dignity of the peerage—of legitimacy, of precedents. Precedents cannot be too old or too new, if anti-popular; and one from the Protectorate is irrefragable, because it impairs security and freedom. Septennial parliaments; how old are they? for the same wicked reason, they are most constitutional. Barracks, which Swift thought required explanation, are necessary to preserve military discipline, and to secure the soldier from the dangers of civil society: yet, if we believe Lord Eldon, when the Earl of Essex was dragooned in Pall Mall, every soldier is a citizen according to the constitution. Worthy interpreter of virtual laws made by virtual representatives! "Words are the daughters of earth, and things are the sons of heaven."

Nicholas Bacon[1] saw this subject in a different view from such dreamers. He said, "Henry the Seventh's guard he only pretended was a ceremony of state, brought from the French court; and yet it is strange it went so well down with a free people. For that prince that will keep guards about his person in the midst of his own people, may as well double them into the pitch of an army whensoever he pleases to be fearful, and so turn the royal power of law into force of arms[2]." The military establishment was imitated

[1] On Government, part 2. p. 114. [2] State Trials, vol. 3. p. 850.

from France, and is not older than Henry the Seventh. His soldiers were called pensioners, then yeomen of the guard, afterwards life-guardsmen; now they are denominated household troops. These now amount to 12,000 men, exactly the number of Louis the Eighteenth's Swiss guards; and the whole military establishment is from 130,000 to 140,000. Where is the precedent for this standing army, or any standing army? Lord Liverpool assures us, "the military establishment in 1792 will not now suit the state, as the population of Great Britain has increased since that period above two millions." Then the increase of the military is for home service. But are the British people more dangerous to king, lords, bishops, and their nominees in the House of Commons, and pluralists and sinecurists, than Bonaparte and all his means of destruction, when he menaced boastingly the British shores? Yet in 1817 the British government have a larger military establishment for their defence and their favourites, than Great Britain when that insolent despot threatened this nation with jeopardy; and in this same year the military establishment costs more by 400,000*l.* than the whole national expense in 1792. How is this to be defended? Not in respect to our finances, unless we recur to Dr. Johnson's correction of Milton; and as the money received by the crown, according to the critic, was on a mercantile account, we infer that the many millions paid to the military are also *a kind of traffic, by which money is circulated without any national impoverishment.* Had he said so, he would have been supported by royal authority; for Frederic II.

of Prussia wrote, in a letter to D'Alembert, "Mes nombreuses armées font circuler les espèces, et repandent dans les provinces avec une distribution égale les subsides que les peuples fournissent au gouvernement." If there be no royal road to mathematics, it appears that there is a royal and military road to political œconomy.

Let us inquire into this circumstance. In 1794 the subsidy to Prussia was calculated at 30*l.* a man for the troops he engaged to furnish, and the subsidy to Sweden was calculated at 40*l.* a man. Such were the prices of man in the cheap markets for belligerent consumption. In another part of the world, in Barbadoes, it is said, "An acre of plantable and productive land is sufficient to supply three persons with food; and that a tenement for a foot soldier must be two acres, and for a horseman four[1]." Here, then, a foot soldier requires land sufficient for six persons, and a horseman requires land sufficient for twelve. In England, considering the bounty, the loss by desertions, the training and clothing the citizen before he becomes a citizen-soldier, according to Lord Eldon, costs a considerable sum, which, with his pay and allowances and accoutrements and lodging, raises his charge on the people to double and treble that of the wages of a day-labourer. If so, supposing a labourer to support himself, 100 000 troops require two or three times their number of labouring people to feed and clothe them; and thus all these soldiers and supporters, to the amount of three or four hundred thousand, are deducted from the productive popula-

[1] Steele and Dickson, &c. p. 174.

tion of the state. This is restricting the remark to the common soldier; for if we consider the aristocracy of the army, field-marshals, generals, colonels[1], an army of 100,000 men pauperizes half a million of labourers, consuming more than they produce. The standing army, this huge appendage of the monarchy, cost in 1817, exclusive of the navy, a sum approaching to seven millions sterling. Considering this item of expense, is it wonderful that the people are poor, oppressed, that they wince, and are irritated? irritated, when they find the military increased beyond any former example—increased in peace beyond its excess in war when the nation was encompassed with peril and disasters—and when a thousand trials are making to find how much may be done by military means, by foreign mercenaries[2], with impunity;—when the military monarchs of Europe afford court models for orders of honour, and the birth-day is kept according to the continental calendar!

We come now to a motley and monstrous assemblage of pensioners, sinecurists, pluralists, who may

[1] In 1816 there were 4 field-marshals, 103 generals, 205 lieutenant-generals, 294 major-generals, 270 colonels, 880 lieutenant-colonels, &c.

[2] Earl Grey asked by what law Colonel Quintin, a German, was employed in the British service? *No answer from ministers.* What wretches are ministers who will serve such purposes! In a fortnight after this question a bill was brought into parliament, in which a clause was inserted, stating that foreigners might be appointed to commissions in British regiments. Mr. Horner noted the anomaly proposed; on which the Speaker said it was so important that he should move that the chairman should report progress. —How many foreigners are now soldiers in the British army?

be called generally state paupers. According to the interpreters of our excellent constitution, the crown must enjoy a prodigious revenue, that the prince may live in splendour. Then the archbishop must enjoy a mighty revenue, and the bishops, that the ecclesiastical halo may accompany with becoming brightness the royal luminary. The splendour of the throne declines with scrupulous minutiæ; and as the day, verging through hours and minutes to the west, ends at midnight, the archbishop, who has twenty or thirty thousand pounds a-year, and who does nothing, sets in a curate having 50*l.*, or even less, who does every thing; for, said the bishop of Worcester, on Lord Harrowby's Curate's Stipend Bill, "on the subject of inequality in the church, it was necessary on a principle of human nature that there should be distinctions[1]." A begging curate and a prince bishop are a bishop's exemplifications of the inequality of human nature. Lord Ellenborough, in the same debate, declared in his usual manner;

> "Turbidus hîc cœno vastaque voragine gurges
> Æstuat——"

"that inequality of rank was as necessary in the church as the state[2]." Admirable constitutionalist!

[1] In 1813.

[2] That the clergy should pauperize the laity is not strange, considering that they have no bowels for their own profession. Year after year bills were brought into parliament by Sir W. Scott and Mr. Perceval, in 1805 and 1808, to relieve the curates; and they failed by the opposition of the ecclesiastics. Thus they forced their body to apply to parliament for 100,000*l.* a year. Begging is also customary in the rich diocese of Durham. There the revenue of the clergy amounts to about 200,000*l.* a year; yet every year

But why, when the bishop is crowned with a mitre, are not curates, as subdeacons were formerly, inducted by the delivery of an empty platter?

By parity of reasoning the commander-in-chief also must enjoy a princely revenue; and the descending scale must also be preserved in pay and in prize-money. When the British took the Havannah under Lord Albemarle, the commander's share of the prize-money was 20,000*l.*, while the privates received 13*s.* 5*d.*; and Lord Palmerstone said, last session [1], that prize money during the late war was distributed on the same principle as in former wars. Thus the commander is esteemed equal to twenty or thirty thousand private soldiers;—and thus the church is directed by the state, and both regulate the army [2]:—admirable harmony!

> "Where order in variety we see,
> And where, though all things differ, all agree."

And for aught I know, this happy adjustment and special concordance is as old as Linus, who sung

> "Omnia sunt unum, sunt omnis singulæ partes."

Of course ministers must live in splendour, and all their families possess offices, emoluments, pensions,

there is a general begging for the poor clergy and their families. If it be not continued, the reform is attributable to the public exposure of this baseness by William Burdon, a scholar, a thinker, and a sincere and strenuous friend of liberty and truth.

[1] 26th June 1817.

[2] So of the navy. In 1813, when there was not an enemy at sea, there were 180 admirals, 798 captains, 595 commanders, besides superannuated officers. These I do not object to, nor to those pensions enjoyed by the naval officers; but to the relative situation

sinecures, &c. Observe, the placeman's salary, though excessive, is not enough; sinecure employments must be added. Mr. Malthus descanted on an over-breeding people, and thence deduced their poverty. Yet Lord Bathurst, in 1815, received of public money as much as the amount of the whole poor rates of the city of Norwich. George Canning, too, was not satisfied with 18,000*l.* a year[1], and the dignity of ambassador during his attendance on a sick child at Lisbon, nor with pensions to his mother and sisters. Nay, he proved to an admiring parliament that this office was put upon him; that it was a losing trade. He indeed is worth his hire. He disdains to reprove innovations[2] which embraces every improvement from the savage state onward, as beneath his high displeasure; he will not tolerate the word reform;—for while some recommend oxygen, or pure vital air, to cure consumptions, this *docteur en droit* prescribes the damps of jails as the only medi-

of the chiefs of the naval establishment, and of the sailors. Lord Albemarle obtained 20 000*l.* and a sailor 13*s.* 5*d.* Yet of the droits of the crown, amounting to millions, a sailor obtains not one penny. There is another point:—To educate 71 boys at the Naval Asylum costs 400,000*l.* The sailors, during the expenditure of these sums by the crown and the aristocracy, starve, die in the streets, or are hanged. Yet these are things that should not be reformed, or moderately reformed. We must speak of them with temper:—political quietism is the worst state-heresy.

[1] He had an office in the alien department, worth annually four days of his pay at Lisbon.

[2] Hume says: "And though many constitutions, and none more than the British, have been improved even by violent innovations, the praise bestowed on those patriots, &c." History, vol. 5. p. 452.

cated atmosphere. Mr. Canning is an orator and an ambassador—so was Demosthenes. But Demosthenes damned Philip and tyrants. Mr. Canning descants against Spence and the Spenceans. When Demosthenes was sent by the republic of Athens to negotiate with the ablest monarch of the age, his salary was about one shilling a day. When Mr. Canning was sent about nothing to nobody, he had fifty pounds a day. Yet who dare doubt the patriotic virtues of Mr. Canning? His virtues shine through him;—nay, virtue is in him like the motion of light in diaphanous bodies;—yet does this miserable man call the people fickle, rebellious, insensate[1]. When has the public voice been declared? The people distinctly condemned the slave-trade, the corn bill; and they have spoken decisively in favour of reformation and œconomy. Time has justified and will justify their determinations. A sneaking enemy, a truckling associate, this sordid man calls all reformers profligates and criminals. Thus, as he exposes his own unprincipled greediness, he riots in popular abuse; and thus he resembles the orator Demades, who sold his country to Philip and Antipater, of whom it was said, He was as a beast after sacrifice, of which nothing remained but the tongue and paunch.

Sinecures pointedly aggravate the rapacity of the holders. The lord treasurer is his own auditor, attorneys-general chief judges, a chief judge his own jailor. Then there is a chief justice of the forest, as

[1] Machiavel says, "La moltitudine e piu savia e piu costante ch' un principe;" and this he proves in one of his longest Discorsi. p. 102.

there was and is possibly an admiral of Connaught. The apostate Wentworth enjoyed the office. But we are told by some, whose high names disgrace the opposition[1], and help the undistinguishing contempt of all parties, that sinecures are necessary to the crown[2], to attract men of talents, and to reward them for their public services. What have been the services of Lord Arden, or Mr. Knox the prothonotary, whose brother possesses also from sixteen to twenty thousand pounds in the church? What have been the mighty deeds and achievements of George Rose[3], who recommends saving banks to the people while he opens the vomitories of the treasury, and who himself, besides lucrative offices, enjoys a sinecure of 8000*l.* a year, which is confirmed to his son in succession? If the public money were forced out of its direct channels to relieve the necessitous and the distinguished, there might be some colour of argument for the abuse. But what has this sinecurist performed, which might not have been adequately and congenially paid by secret service money? Thus it is in other parts of the world.

[1] The bill introduced by the ministry, which was opposed by sinecurists and patriots, proposed to reduce in *twelve years* places amounting to 57,000*l.*, to pensions amounting to 42,000*l.*

[2] Those men consider the power of the crown and the authority of the people as directly opposed. Sir N. Wraxall was attacked by all parties. I wonder his sighing over the extinction of some places did not excuse him a little; he said, "it deprived the crown of that species of majesty produced by the operation of time and the hoar of ages;—and that this was calculated to protect and perpetuate the sanctity of the monarchical office." vol. 2. p. 182.

[3] He wrote an answer to Charles Fox's History, and every observation was false without exception. The whole was a tissue of falsehood. He wrote a pamphlet to prove that the influence of

At Surat, says Niebuhr, there is no hospital for human beings; but there is an extensive one for inferior animals. I saw a great tortoise in it; it was blind, helpless, and very old.

No point is more *constitutional* in Great Britain, than that because a man had an opulent office, he should enjoy, on quitting it, a large pension or sinecure. Why one who had been chancellor, or ambassador, or prime minister, or lord of the admiralty, and was enormously paid in office, should have, on his retirement from office, pensions or sinecures, is inconceivable[1]; except it be a maxim, that every one connected with the government enjoys a right of commonage over the whole property of the people. For it is not only Lord Sandwich, who on his retiring from the admiralty became ranger of the park, and his son Lord Hinchinbroke master of the buck-hounds;—but from these mighty ones spring another retinue of sinecurists and

the crown had not increased; when no family, that pretends to gentility, is without a placeman or an expectant. In this pamphlet he bears testimony to Mr. Pitt's extravagance, who had in 1789 greatly embarrassed himself, and who refused a subscription from ship owners, &c. to relieve him. This he eulogizes. I was informed by the person who was deputed to the editor and the printer of a Sunday newspaper, who were imprisoned for two years, and fined a thousand pounds; that if they chose their fine should be paid, and they should never be made acquainted with the means of the payment. Yet these men, who had not thousands a year, and who were suffering in a public cause—the cause of truth—refused to accept my friend's offer, and actually paid the fine out of their own narrow funds.

[1] If there be honour in the officer or the office, he should be paid less than the marketable loss in obtaining the office. At Venice ambassadors received no salary. Wickfort, p. 113.

pensioners, as it is said the locusts arose from the blood of the giants. Mr. Edward Cooke, Lord Castlereagh's under secretary, retires with 4000*l.* compensation for his eminent services; and this man has another minor retinue, who under gracious names are quartered on the community [1].

Such are the pregnant causes of the people's poverty, which Mr. Malthus and his school could not see, do not see, and will not understand. Nature and overbreeding!! No, it is what made Catiline poor—*alieni appetens, sui profusus;* it is what impoverished the Roman state, *rapti largiuntur*. Is not this the state of Britain? Is not the treasury pennyless? Is not the prince poor, aye, the poorest? "What," says Temple, "is the fantastic calculation of riches and poverty that is current in the world, by which a man that wants a million is a prince, he that wants a groat is a beggar [2]!" Are not the nobles poor? they are pensioners and immersed in debt. Are not the members of the House of Commons poor? poor in every sense: having appropriated the rights of the people, they have squandered their fortunes; while mendicant ministers require their sa-

[1] Pension on retirement £1500
Compensation of a reversion 500
Ex-revenue officer..... 400
Keeper of the Irish Records 1000
His wife keeper of Dublin-castle, which she keeps as he does the records 600
£4000

Compare Secretary Walsingham, in Hume's History, vol. 5. p. 521, to this under-secretary. In short, England now pays inversely as she is served.

[2] United Provinces, p. 50.

laries to be continued when they do nothing, even when they are discharged. Very different are they, nay, in direct opposition to the thrifty yet generous individuals of the time of Queen Elizabeth. Then large private fortunes were expended for public purposes. "Such," says Hume, "was the spirit of Elizabeth's reign[1]." If distress pervade the higher orders, even those "who stand in the gap and trade of more preferments," when many escape to the continent or America, and families are expatriated by taxation, must not the people be poor, who support themselves and all others? a tremendous train—the crown; many courts; principalities; an increasing pensioned nobility; a House of Commons, bought and sold frequently in a single session; an ecclesiastical establishment, which costs yearly eight or ten millions, with tithing which ruins more than it extorts; a military establishment, whose annual charge to the people exceeds six millions sterling; a crowd of pensioners, sinecurists, placemen, pluralists, who are again involved in an atmosphere of consuming insects, each of which, like the blistering cantharis that exudes a clinging grub, generates a self-ravening disease; for now placemen and pensioners, having exhausted the people, prey on each other, through habitual craving and insatiable voracity. These are the causes of the increase of the poor, and of the accelerated advance of general delinquency.

The friends of the commonalty have solicited reform, have appealed to records against the duration of parliament; against the nomination of the Commons by lords and individuals, and against the monstrous waste and prodigality of the national substance through the

[1] vol. 5. p. 379.

means of parliament. They have been repelled, contemned, slightingly told that ancient times suit not modern circumstances. They then unwillingly, being precluded from learning of their ancestry in Britain, are forced to regard the conduct of their children beyond the Atlantic.

Those who originally left England for America were few and poor[1], and not remarkable for their morality. It is computed[2], that about 80,000 persons left these countries prior to the middle of the last century. In 1749, the whole white population in the United States was estimated at 1,046,000[3]. In 1782, by a return to congress, the population amounted to 2,389,300. In 1790, the inhabitants amounted to 3,929,326. In 1800, to 5,309,758; in 1810, to 7,239,903. It is probable, that now the population reaches eight and a half or nine millions;—such is the advance of the United States, to which, so lately as 1766, England transported her criminals.

This advance, though partly attributable to situation, soil, &c. is mainly to be referred to the constitution and the government of these provinces; for South America, which is equally favoured, halts comparatively in its progress. The constitution of America is determinate[4] and *written*[5], and acknowledges

[1] Davenant's Works, vol. 2. p. 3. [2] Ann. Register, 1760, p. 195.

[3] I take these numbers from Pitkin's Statistical View, p. 174. 256.

[4] Hume says, "The sacred veil which had hitherto covered the English constitution, and which threw an obscurity upon it so advantageous to royal prerogative," &c. vol. 6. p. 117. Yet it appears that the *ambiguous nature*, as he elsewhere calls it, promoted the destruction of Charles. p. 207.

[5] The vagrant character of the English constitution I have exposed in Defects, &c. of the English Laws.

no hereditary sovereign; the president is elected every four years, and he receives 25,000 dollars (not 6,000*l.*), about the sixth part of Lord Arden's sinecure.

America has no hereditary legislators, no house of lords; the senators are elected every six years.

The house of representatives is elected every two years, almost by universal suffrage, and districts increase their numbers by one representative for every 30,000 additional voters. There are no boroughs, close or open. The ordinary congress or parliament cannot alter a fundamental law [1], nor advance their own trust to three and seven years; there is no undefined privilege [2] belonging to the American parliament. There is no ecclesiastical establishment; no state religious establishment; no tithes; no intolerance for faith sake; all sects are equally eligible to all offices.

There is no court of equity; no ex-officio informations; no special juries. Paine's Politics and *Reason*, and the like, are published with equal indifference and security in America [3]. There are no sinecure places; no pensions to ministers and minions; no secret service money, which in 1810 in England amounted to 270,000*l.* and in 1815 to 175,000*l.*

The salaries of the public officers are small; the

[1] The president, December 2, 1817, signified that congress cannot, by the constitution, enact a law for roads and canals through the United Provinces, and that congress must request an enlargement of their powers for this purpose. Yet the Irish parliament committed suicide.

[2] "These privileges are at present as undetermined as were formerly the prerogatives of the crown." Hume, vol. 6. p. 459. More so.

[3] Vanderkemp laments that infidelity is general in North America, and that Paine's works are found in the lowest cottages.

second in dignity in the state receives only 5000 dollars (about 1100*l.*) a year. Yet the common seamen in the service of the American government receive four times greater wages than British sailors; in America there is no pressing. There are few soldiers in the American states; but there are 800,000 militia. America had contracted debts in attaining her liberty and securing her power, and in 1809 her government extinguished 33,580,000 dollars of debt, the whole that could be liquidated according to the original contract with the public creditor. At present, having purchased Louisiana and Florida, having increased by peaceful means her provinces from thirteen to twenty, having concluded a war of difficulty and expense,—Mr. Monroe, the president of America, December 2, 1817, called on congress to repeal all the internal taxes[1], America being restored to the situation it enjoyed under Mr. Jefferson, when a tax-gatherer was unknown in the United States. Such are the products of popular representation. It increases the people, and it increases still more their opulence, their agriculture, their manufactures: in 1790, America did not possess a single cotton-mill; after a few years it counted a score; they now exceed a hundred.

Let the British learn of their children to redeem themselves from the abyss into which ministry has forced them; let them resume their rights. The constitution of Great Britain is essentially popular—all who are

[1] Yet England, taxed till the heart-strings of her people crack, after paying the interest on the debt and sinking fund, amounting to 44 millions, has seven millions for the current expenses of the empire—the revenue being 51 millions: I omit fractions.

not king and nobles are the people, are designated the commonalty. How utterly absurd then is the doctrine, that king and lords and people are coequal! unless we speak *virtually*. James the First called himself the great servant of the public: the king is the chief officer of the state,—how then can one man paid by the people be esteemed tantamount to the people? How can the nobles, who spring from the king, countervail the commons? To say so is miserable flattery, beginning with crown lawyers and ending with the laureat's choir:

> " For 'tis their duty, all the learned think,
> T'espouse the cause by whom they eat and drink."

Yet this has infatuated kings, maddened nobles, and ruined the people. They (the minions of the crown) told the king, " Creation's heir, the world, the world is thine," that the more he spent the circulation of wealth was quickened: though truly the expenditure of kings (I speak not of what is necessary for them, but of their regimental state and their prerogative prodigality,) is a greater loss than the burning decrees of Bonaparte to British merchandise. Œconomists talk of the cost of production; but there is a cost of consumption—a *superlucrative* loss; for where much is to be consumed, much is often consumed in that consumption. Besides, a fête at court, some gewgaw of furniture or equipage, and the like, occasions a general imitation, and waste and want succeed. Hence every man connected with the crown, directly or indirectly, is paid excessively, and is excessively distressed—even to Trip, who raises money by way of annuity.

Œconomy is slighted as a shop-keeping article. Hence immense salaries, sinecures, pensions; hence political prodigality, bribery, and corruption[1]. Money must be had; lands are mortgaged, the peer is bought, and his price purchases many. Money must be had: the government confederates with the Bank; and the late rational Mr. Horner characterized truly their intimacy, "as exhibiting the most profligate profusion on one part, and the greatest rapacity on the other." Hence arises a national debt, which has utterly changed the property, the character of property in this country; for the proprietors of lands and houses are in fact tenants to public creditors, who are usufructuaries, and who, in some degree, are an unproductive order. Thus to the landed gentry have been added moneyed gentlemen, who are a load and an impoverishment. "Let states," said Bacon, "that aim at greatness, take heed how their nobility and gentlemen multiply too fast; for that makes the common subject grow to be a peasant and base swain driven out of heart, and in effect but a gentleman's labourer; so that there will be great population and little strength."

The government has increased its nobility and its gentlemen; and instead of relieving the people, it labours to support perversely the creatures of its vices

[1] Ambassadors were called court-spies:—they are something more now. Coxe says, that except Eugene, all the Austrian ambassadors received largesses from Riperda's agents, "Even the emperor himself did not blush to encourage this venal traffic by his own example." Eugene said, Much may be done in London by the same means. What are these snuff-boxes of 1000*l.* value, but bribes?

and its mismanagement. The government endeavours to support the landed interest by corn laws. Shallow ministers! Locke long since said[1], "The public expenses of government will fall on the land; —the labourer cannot, the merchant will not;—therefore the landholder must." This is particularly true in England, where wages are ruled directly by statute, and indirectly by the poor-rates. The corn law also, as I have said, is of the same description; which, if it succeeded by enhancing the quartern loaf and upholding the price of land, must be nugatory or worse, for the poor-rates must increase in proportion. Sir James Steuart said[2], "If therefore, according to modern œconomy, the lowest species of labour must be kept cheap in order to make manufactures flourish, the state must be at the expense of the children." This has been the case, and exhibits truly the wondrous sentimentality of the poor laws. On this reasoning, supposing that the corn laws effected their intended purpose, the state must have been at the expense not only of the children but of their parents also.

The expedients of the government to support its being by its extravagance, might be exemplified by a starving animal gnawing its own members. Mark their dilemma:—the supporters of government prepare to fall off, if they are not paid for the discredit attached to their service; and the people are incapable, were they willing, of still affording the means of bribing their enemies to their own destruction. This

[1] Observations, &c. p. 95. [2] vol. 1. p. 155.

the ministry at one time call Jacobinism, at another rebellion; sometimes also a transition from war to peace. It is the transition of the prodigal who prepares to settle his accounts. Transition! It is of bad to worse—when the leprous disease having overspread the body falls inward on the sources of life. It is a transition from worse to worst; and the government would correct it accordingly:—they outlaw the nation, suborn the base, abuse the unsuspecting, drive the objects of their hate from town to country, sink them in prisons—in prisons where they (contrary to law) consign them, unheard and unseen, to their own solitary executioners; prosecute day after day, on the same lying charge, the same victim: their impotence and malice correspond, like the torpedo, whose shocks when dying quicken in number as they decrease in force.

The people will not bear this maltreatment much longer; they cannot:—they must resume their rights. The situation of the governors and the governed approaches the state antecedent to order—when levity contended with weight, and darkness with light[1]; it is of the few against many, of one against all. Under such abuse of power and property Lord Liverpool might well be affrighted by the increasing population of Great Britain. He is not particular in this respect: the multitude was troublesome to Egyptian sovereigns[2], who, to secure their despotism, effeminated[3] the men, and introduced sectarian dissension

[1] Mollia cum duris, sine pondere habentia pondus.

[2] Plutarch says, υπο πληθους. Moral. p. 278.

[3] Scholia in Œdip. Coloneus of Sophocles.

among the people [1]. This has been the resource of the enemies of toleration and liberty in the British councils. But it will not again avail. Many, which are the wicked one's weakness, are the people's strength. Besides, the many think, they understand, they have long felt; the people have determined;—the crisis approaches; and if justice be not promptly rendered to the people, the *choice of Hercules* must be achieved by the *force of Hercules*.

CHAPTER VIII.

Conclusion—Summary view.

I DO not say that none propagate improvidently; but that the improvidence of the people, in this respect, is only one cause in many of the miseries of the people's making. And in saying this I exonerate government and the laws—the chief causes of public misery—from many human afflictions. Every vice and imprudence occasion a portion of misery; and if the propagation of mankind now ceased, misery would continue; unless we conclude that the sterility and the perfectibility of the human race are identical expressions. Mr. Malthus geometrizes, multiplies the bred into breeders; wonders and cries with Archimedes, "I have discovered it!" as if all hurried together, like the atoms of Democritus. On the contrary, the moral check, which escaped Mr. Malthus

[1] The very bill that was the cause of the preceding ministry abandoning their situation—and against which the present ministry raised the *No Popery* yell,—the same ministry introduced themselves last session, and it passed without notice.

entirely in the first edition of his work, and crossed him only in vision in the second, perpetually operates in every class of society; and perhaps few have reached a certain age without having suffered frequently its admonitions and control. What are all the laws of marriage, but this moral providence authenticated by the supreme authority of nations?

I do not see *deep-seated causes of evil in nature* (to use Mr. Malthus's expression). There are accidents which no prudence can prevent, and malignant and pinching seasons intervene. I say seriously and sincerely, I cannot call these evil;—they may be necessary, they may be good, they may be indifferent. But when Mr. Malthus refers a propensity to breed to the same abyss of mysterious evil, I deny the imputation. Without any pretensions to reason beyond experience, I call this propensity a manifest good, without which man and woman separately would exhibit incomplete creatures.

The power to generate is strenuous, but not self-destructive; and the ability to increase rapidly the species is essentially beneficial. Thus society is enabled to retrieve its occasional losses and criminal mortality. The Romans lived in perpetual warfare; every year four legions were raised of 4000 foot and 200 horse[1], each of which occasionally was increased to 5000 foot and 300 horse[2]. At the battle of Cannæ, of 80,000 foot and 6000 horse[3] (the whole

[1] Polybius, lib. 1. c. 16.

[2] Ibid. lib. 3. c. 107. Ten legions were enrolled against the Volsci, of 4000 each. Dion Hal. lib. 6. c. 42.

d. c. 113.

army), 70,000 were slain [1]. Yet after this destruction and the immense waste of men in this war, the consuls again brought into the field a powerful army. The followers of Odin were still more incessant in their wars; and so prodigal were they of life, that a death not violent was ignominious [2]. What destruction of people in France during the last 25 years —forced emigrations, murders on the scaffold, civil wars! Hoche computed that the war of La Vendée cost the republic 600,000 Frenchmen;—wars by sea and land throughout the world. In 1794 France counted 750,000 in the field, and nearly 400,000 in the reserve or sick. In 1798 it was decreed that every Frenchman was a soldier, and the conscription affected all men from 20 to 25 years of age. Mons. Pradt estimates the loss of the French in six campaigns in the Peninsula at 600,000. Jomini states the levy in 1812 and 1813 at 1,307,000, and specifies their situation and duties. Of the 524,000 who assailed Russia, of which a considerable body was French, few returned. Yet the next year the French, after many sanguinary battles, brought 170,000 Frenchmen into the field at Leipsic. And the next year they fought the allies, and suffered severely. Yet after these monstrous losses in men France contained, according to Mons. Mentelle, after the treaty

[1] Polybius, lib. 6. c. 56. Paterculus says, that a few years after Rome was taken by the Gauls it became very populous. lib. 1. c. 14.

[2] Mallet, vol. 1. p. 102. Temple was shown by Oxenstiern, a bay in Sweden where those *past all military action threw themselves*. Works, vol. 1. p. 216.

of Paris, 28,246,360 inhabitants, which corresponds with the calculation of Mons. Calonne[1] of the population of France in 1797.

"Les débris s'animaient, la mort était féconde,
Et la déstruction renouvellait le monde."

Such is the disposition of the people to repair the ruin of their rulers—of life to have an heir—of matter to be organized. This passion, this energy, is evinced in various countries and situations. Park says[2], "Notwithstanding the exterminating system, it is surprising to behold how soon an African town is rebuilt and repeopled." The spirit of reviviscence is singularly exhibited in Smyrna. Previous to 1675 it had been six several times partially destroyed;—in 1688 it was assailed with three of the greatest calamities—a fire, an earthquake, and an inundation of the sea;—repeated convulsions, annual pestilences, are its visitants:—yet even amidst the Turkish empire it continues and increases; and when Mr. Hobhouse wrote, the population, amounted to 150,000 inhabitants[3]. The tenacity of life, the disposition to continue existence, is evinced by the Berebbers, sons of the descendants of those who probably possessed Carthage before the Tyrian colonists;—by the Copts, no inefficient population the representatives of the ancient Egyptians;—by the Pariars of Hindostan; the Poolears of Malabar, who are also esteemed the aborigines of the country, though they are loathed and abhorred;—by the Parsees, a considerable body

[1] Tableau de l'Europe, p. 10.
[2] Travels, p. 291.
[3] Travels, p. 616.

living at Guzarat, who fled a thousand years ago (in 767) from Kirman, to avoid the persecution of the Mahometans. Regard the Gipsies; whether they are descended from the vagrants mentioned by Juvenal, or from Indian refugees who escaped the cruelties of Timour, or whether they are descended from Egyptians, according to Mons. Gebelin,—they live in spite of all privations of life.

Thus do I show no disposition to lessen the argument of those who travail in their discourse about the propensity of men to propagate their race. Grant that man is as prone to breed as matter to descend, and that gravitation and generation are twins of one necessity. Yet, unhappily, there is a power which can neutralize desire and extinguish the sources of generation. It is true, men survive ages and centuries of persecution; and though they inhabit the pole and the line, and promontories and rocks the most inhospitable, yet they shall not outlive despotism. True, Ormus [1], a barren rock of volcanic formation, the basis salt, without a spring or rivulet, having little rain, producing no food, the heat intolerable, was populous and opulent; while in an opposite extremity Samoida [2], which to the misery of a disastrous climate and sterile land endures taxation, is inhabited. So is Finmark, though the inhabitants are tithed for the fish [3] they catch with diffi-

[1] Vincent's Nearchus, p. 322 et seq.—Pinkerton's Voyages, vol. 9. p. 405.

[2] Every one who pulls a bow is to pay a skin worth 25 copecs. Pinkerton, vol. 1. p. 530.

[3] This was divided by Christian the Fifth, (of glorious memory,

culty. So under the 69th degree of latitude, on the banks of the Mosenelo, which the wandering Laplanders seldom visit, a colony of Norwegians established themselves; and they have never required foreign assistance. Hamerfest also, which may be called midway between earth and Erebus, where the smaller vegetables will not germinate nor trees grow, which labours under a continual fog; yet counts forty inhabitants. True: and let those who insist upon the original sin of breeding by a compound ratio, or a geometrical series; let all revilers of the poor, among whose greatest miseries are such slanders, take advantage of these facts: nay, if it serve them, let them know that the population of Lapmarken in Swedish Finland, from 1751 to 1801, has increased from 26,000 to 52,000.

Such is the power of generation and of life in mankind;—man will live and increase where the land is rock, the water ice, under perpetual night; where "the air burns frore, and cold performs the effect of fire." Yet despotism is worse than all these together; and man perishes under misgovernment, though surrounded with a wilderness of enjoyments. What other cause reduced many populous countries to deserts, and continues them so? Have they become effete? has mortality struck the elements of their composition? There can be no competent cause assigned for the immense tracts of land once populous, and equally fruitful now as then, but misrule; for we find with liberty,

says Leems,) between the king, the church, and the clergyman. Pinkerton, vol. 1. p. 446.

which approaches to self-government[1], the same countries resume their populousness and opulence, though otherwise they are the least productive and inviting; while throughout the world, the utmost bounties of soil, climate, and situation are attended with misery and distress. Mons. le Poivre says, "In the midst of all this luxuriance of nature, the Malay is miserable: the culture of the land, abandoned to slaves, is fallen into contempt[2]." Bernier[3] speaks also of the Mogul's territories, "that even of those that would be fertile, there is much that is not used for want of workmen, some of which have perished by the too evil treatment of the governors, who often take from their necessary livelihood, and their very children whom they make slaves." So in Tehama[4]; the land gives three crops, and the people are miserable. So in Egypt; Bruce has spoken of the abundance of the land and the misery of the people; and Legh, one of the last travellers in that country, says, "that the productiveness of the soil and the destitution of the inhabitants are contrasted." So in Elis, which also had its triple harvests[5]. So at Titza[6], the inhabitants are "employed

[1] Hydra, the Aristera of the ancients, is a rock about a league from the main land of Cape Skyllo, almost bare, having only one town, which, however, contains inhabitants sufficient to man eighty ships of 300 tons burthen; they have purchased of the Porte the independent election of their own magistrates, &c. Hobhouse's Travels, p. 600.

[2] Ann. Register, 1769, p. 243.

[3] Pinkerton.

[4] Niebuhr, c. 131.

[5] ——————τριπολοις σπορον εν νειοισιν
Εσθ' οτε βαλλοντες, &c. Theocrit. Idyl. 25. ver. 25.

[6] Hobhouse's Travels, p. 85.

in the cultivation of a rich soil, and in the tending numerous flocks; their wine, their corn, their meat, the fleeces and skins and even the milk of their sheep and goats, all were to be sold to raise so exorbitant a tax, that they were starving in the midst of abundance." It was from observing that men were desolate amidst the prodigality of all things, that some writers have declared that the productiveness of the land was unfriendly to industry. It is true, the wretchedness of a country may serve the population. Thus Landt says, "The Feroe Islands contain a happy and comparatively ingenious people, which they derive from their unpromising soil and situation, which have preserved them from the oppression of Denmark." A rich country is miserable, because it is worth oppressing; and a poor one happy, because it is abandoned to its own management, in despair of extorting any profit amidst its wants. Burnet says, in his Travels, "The bailage of Lugano is the worst country, the least productive, the most exposed to cold, and the least capable of trade of any in all Italy, and yet it is the best-peopled. If ever this country is brought under a yoke like that which the rest of Italy bears, it will soon be abandoned; for nothing draws so many people to live in so bad a soil, when they are in sight of the best soil in Europe, but the easiness of the government." Here is the secret. For it is most absurd to fancy that richness of soil, genial influence of climate, convenience of the situation, should occasion idleness and sloth; it might be as well said that men would be remiss in proportion to the returns of their labour; that is, they would be unaffected inversely according to their mo-

tives to action. The dread of excessive population is a vain terror; the true terrors, which should be repeated perpetually in adamantine terms, are unpopular rulers, perverse laws, wasteful institutions, the bad growing worse, and no hope, except through ruin, of reformation. If the soil and climate be inhospitable, freedom will make life easy;—if the soil be generous and the climate kind, no matter how few the people, they will be wretched under misrule. Italy, in Burnet's time, was thinly peopled, and of the few many were beggars; yet during its æra of republics it was populous and rich, and cultivated to admiration. It is now more miserable than Ireland. Spain also,—at once continental and insular, with every facility for commerce, with all opportunities for the most varied productions,—was and is thinly peopled, and abounds and abounded in mendicants of every description; while Holland, a province of that empire, by breaking its bondage became the most populous of modern nations, and considering its territory pre-eminently opulent, and this opulence was transmitted down to the lowest orders of the people. This Mr. Malthus is obliged to admit: but ignorantly or wilfully mistaking, he refers principally to the greater average mortality as the cause "which contributed to render Holland so famous for the management of her poor, and able to employ and support all who applied for relief[1]:" which is contrary to his own sentiments, as he speaks on other occasions[2] of the benefit of healthy situations. The fact is, Holland was a republic; it was therefore not oppressed with courts; and patron-

[1] vol. 2. p. 334.

[2] vol. 2. p. 129.

age, which costs so much among the necessary and elegant appendages of royalty, was unknown. There were no tithes; the dignity of the peerage was also unknown as an expense. The states-general cost nothing in direct bribes, or places, or pensions, or sinecures. De Witt, though a minister among the richest citizens in the world, had a small salary for incessant application to the public business. The ambassadors of Holland were men of business [1], and they received no snuff-boxes and the like ambiguous presents: all were popularly governed, and all were busily employed. In 1669 the United Provinces contained 2,400,000 inhabitants, and those who were not actively and productively employed amounted only to 200,000, which included "gentry without calling, statesmen, officers, usurers, soldiers, beggars." "The Dutch," says Temple [2], "increased in wealth by the utmost thrift, the utmost industry and temperance of living, almost sordid." These habits enabled them to support the greatest expenditure without suffering; and as no man wasted, all were supplied.

In Holland the people were most numerous and most opulent;—such circumstances commonly coincide. Thus Thucydides [3] speaks of the city of Amphilochia as most *wealthy and populous*; and he adds, that becoming distressed, they incorporated the Ambraciots with themselves: thence it appears, that they considered an increase of people an increase of riches. The same historian [4] speaks of Athens, that after the plague it recovered *its people and riches*. Attica, says Poly-

[1] Wickfort, p. 541, is angry at their reserve.
[2] vol. 2. p. 66. Works. [3] lib. 2. p. 144. [4] lib. 6. p. 430.

bius, was most populous, and richer than all Peloponnesus[1]. Xenophon[2] speaks of countries universally inhabited, and abounding in sheep, corn, &c. So Machiavel[3] describes Florence, that the city never was more happy, full of riches and credit, the citizens fit to bear arms 30,000, and those of the surrounding country 70,000. Few people imply generally a poor state[4].

Yet some have actually, in this age of spasmodic philosophy and desperate politics, reasoned, that to reduce the people would improve their power and comforts. This is just as original as the argument, that the national debt was a mine of wealth. How superior is Mr. Malthus to Aristotle, who said that a state to be powerful must abound with inhabitants[5]! and to Hume[6], that "the happiness of any society and its populousness are necessary attendants."

[1] Polybius, lib. 2. c. 62. [2] p. 112. [3] Storia, p. 52.

[4] Procopius says, that Britain was so populous, that the British, with their wives and families, often emigrated to the Franks. De Bello Gothico, lib. 4. c. 20. It was poor, but it could not have been populous. In the ancient writers *mansa carnicata familia* (a hide of land) was considered land sufficient for one family; this quantity of land, it was supposed, one plough could cultivate in a year. It is computed at 100 or 120 acres. And I find Spenser rates Ulster according to ancient records at 9000 plough lands, each of which containing 120 acres, value forty shillings. State of Ireland. England is, perhaps, four times as populous as it was in the time of Procopius; and if so, forty times more rich. To cultivate land or manufactures supposes capital; and to cultivate either or any branch of industry to the highest advantage, implies accumulated capital. So much again for ratios geometric and arithmetic, and of people pressing against subsistence.

[5] δει δε μαλλον μη εις το πληθος, εις δε δυναμιν αποβλεπειν· ου γαρ ταυτον μεγαλη τε πολις και πολυανθρωπος. De Repub. lib. 7. c. 4.

[6] Essays, vol. 1. p. 405.

I profess myself decidedly in favour of populousness. Without an increasing population, what would have induced savages to emancipate themselves from their immediate wants? How would they have extended their domain? The Numidians[1] were prevented from cultivating their fertile land until they had won it from the beasts; and to this day there is a tribe of Arabs[2], who are freed from tribute because they hunt lions, or, in the language of the country, live on the flesh of lions. Had not mankind increased, they would have held a doubtful empire over the earth, and never have advanced beyond the hunting-state.

By their continued multiplication mankind have passed from hunters to shepherds; and thence, from shifting as the sward was cropped, and wandering over a waste world, they stopped, and of the rude earth made tilth. Then agriculture became an art, cultivation a science, and many men were born. These, improving in power as they increased in numbers, reduced rivers within their banks, purified swamps or made them arable. By increasing population and successive exertion the atmosphere was tempered, and even the Euxine ceased to freeze. By many men seas have been repressed, the Baltic subsides; *while* with the decline of population all is reversed. The inhabitants of Persia, who formerly made fertile the parched land by subterranean aqueducts, cannot now cultivate the richest valleys; while in Egypt the means of health formerly have now become a source of disease. In Sparta, Argos, Corinth, along the banks of the Alpheus, and particularly at Patros, the stagnant water causes

[1] Strabo, lib. 2. [2] Bruce's Travels, Introduct. p. 26.

epidemics. How wretched is Campania! Ask the cause; the answer is, The want of people. The medicine for this want is better government; man revives of course with freedom. Eustace, speaking of the country along the Tyrrhene sea, says, "It is still disastrous in the heats of summer, though every method has been employed to drain the marshes and purify the atmosphere. Of all those methods, the increase of population occasioned by the commerce of Leghorn has been the most effectual." Leghorn was a free port.

It is by increasing and increased population that nations have been enabled to effect a police among themselves. "In Arabia," says Niebuhr[1], "as in all other thinly inhabited countries, robbery is practised." Until people have accumulated, how can the division of hundreds and the like be made available for intercourse or security? The *petite guerre*, the confusion of the middle ages, arose as much from the unsupported state of population as from immorality and barbarism. Men are merchandise, without referring to the slave trade. They are money, without being stamped at the mint. Many men are themselves a great machine. How could the division of labour have originated or been serviceable, if men were not multiplied and condensed? In a thinly peopled country, each man is his own artist; and in a state a little more advanced, the same mechanic jobs at many trades, and he succeeds accordingly. Smith says[2], "It is the great multiplication of the production of all the different arts, in consequence of the division of

[1] c. 108. [2] Wealth of Nations, b. 1. c. 1.

labour, which occasions, in a *well-governed society*, that universal opulence which extends itself to the lowest ranks of the people." And this opulence did extend to many of the lowest English, though not well governed, before the last dreadful and treacherous war, which has confounded all orders, and reduced all to want, and many to poverty and ruin.

When I praise populousness, I mean distinctively freemen. Of slaves I speak not;—a slave makes one miserable and two vicious. Whatever approaches slavery deranges mind, body, feeling, and language[1].

Populousness is good, if the government be good; and, as Hume says, "every country will abound with people and their comforts as it is well governed." Under a well-organized constitution, authentic laws, and their prudent administration, the people will improve their intelligence; and this will regulate their number, by ascertaining their wants and conveniencies. That constitution is best which effects the greatest good to all without injuring any. If one obtains more than his usefulness merits, if one obtains less than his usefulness deserves, society is disturbed, and in proportion to the amount of the iniquity. Every one should possess absolutely his time and the profits of his labour: and as the pains to obtain things teach prudence in their use, he who earns will best employ the produce of his industry. In like manner, those who contribute to the public should not merely determine the necessity and quantity of the supply, but super-

[1] Ker Porter, speaking of forty persons employed on a wind-instrumen says, "I inquired who the instrument belonged to; by that word both pipes and men are included."

intend its expenditure:—therefore, that representation is most secure which is most popular; and that administration is most efficient which introduces domestic œconomy into the management of public affairs. Tillage without tithes, trade without excise, intercourse without toll, commerce without duties, professions without enforced apprenticeships, wages without statutory limitation, industry without control, or formulary, or tax;—these establish liberty and security, and consummate human enjoyment. In consequence, whatever lessens expense is good: for expense is supported by labour, labour is onerous, and the burthen is the people's. Utility should be regarded in all political concerns, and utility can only be learned of the people, through the people;—the people are the eye, the light, the object, and the mirror.

Far be it from my philosophy to adorn one with the attributes of all, and to starve the board of many, that he who supports a *royal servitude* may sicken with plethora and kill sense with enjoyment. Still further be it from me to prefer the few to the many: for this multiplies a single mischief; transforms the dog to Cerberus, and the snake to Hydra. The people, the many, the commonalty—these are the only legitimate objects of philosophical legislation. What are patricians as contradistinguished to the people? Parentage. What nobles? The will of one man,—of one weak man, made weaker by flattery and dominion. It is that monstrous perversion—counting the many as ciphers, and one or the few as millions—which has occasioned disaster, distraction, revolutions in states and societies, and which has confounded, outraged,

overwhelmed mankind in all countries and ages. The wickedness and infatuation of ambitious individuals to move a great weight by an inferior force, and to continue the extravagance, may be called the *great war*. It contravenes the principles of matter, of mind, of the earth, and universe. As this world is to itself, so should citizens be to each other, and all to the state. The world has no prerogative atoms, no negative masses, none which are acted on and do not actuate. The attraction of the earth is not at either pole, nor at its centre, nor at its surface; it is the result of the gravitation of all its parts.

ERRATA.

Page.	*Line.*	
28	9,	*after* them *insert* ".
31	8,	*for* Polowhe *read* Polo.
50	19,	*after* of *insert* the.
58	14 and 15,	*dele* " and at line 17 *place* " *after* united.
69	26,	*for* despotism *read* despotisms.
101	4,	*for* 100,000 *read* 10,000.
107	16,	*for* women *read* woman.
137	17,	*for* chime *read* chine.
252	5,	*for* there public *read* the republic.

Printed by R. and A. Taylor, Shoe-lane, Fleet-street.

WORKS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1. PRINCIPLES of MORALITY.

2. The INDEPENDENT MAN; or, An Essay on the Formation and Development of those Principles and Faculties of the Human Mind, which constitute Moral and Intellectual Excellence.

3. NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

4. NATIONAL EDUCATION.

5. DEFECTS of the ENGLISH LAWS and TRIBUNALS.

6. On the CATHOLIC QUESTION.

7. STATE of IRELAND.

8. No VETO.

9. STATE of EUROPE in January 1816.

Ensor, George,

An inquiry concerning the population of nations containing a refutation of Mr. Malthus's essay on population

London 1818

Pol.g. 264 m
urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10768891-1